

approved 28 June 1879 (21 Stat. 37) (33 U.S.C. 642).

### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 8, 1977:

#### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Robert E. Raiche, of New Hampshire, to be U.S. marshal for the district of New Hampshire for the term of 4 years.

Hugh Salter, of North Carolina, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of North Carolina for the term of 4 years.

Juan G. Blas, of Guam, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Guam for the term of 4 years.

Donald D. Forsht, of Florida, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Florida for the term of 4 years.

The above nominations were approved subject to the nominees' commitments to respond to requests to appear and testify

before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

### WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate, September 8, 1977:

Peter E. Corning, of New York, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of New York for the term of 4 years, vice James M. Sullivan, Jr., resigned, which was sent to the Senate on June 29, 1977.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### PRAISES ARTICLE BY REPRESENTATIVE CLARENCE LONG

#### HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 7, 1977

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, Representative CLARENCE LONG of Maryland, had an article in the spring issue of the magazine *International Security* under the title, "Nuclear Proliferation: Can Congress Act in Time?"

It merits the attention of all of us, and I am taking the liberty of having it reprinted in the RECORD:

NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION: CAN CONGRESS ACT IN TIME?

(By CLARENCE D. LONG)

The threat of nuclear proliferation can scarcely be overstated. As many as forty countries, typically underdeveloped and unstable, may have nuclear weapons capabilities by 1990.<sup>1</sup> More likely than an all-out nuclear war beginning between superpowers is a nuclear exchange between small countries, and a nuclear war anywhere has to be assumed to risk escalation to superpower involvement whether by deliberate intervention, or by miscalculation, bluff, or panic. Even between two small nations, a nuclear war could result in unprecedented death and destruction, with the United States being called upon to supply billions of dollars for humanitarian relief, and with environmental damage that would scarcely respect borders.

Paranoia caused by nuclear weapons proliferation would complicate defense planning.<sup>2</sup> The United States could be compelled to prepare against a variety of threats from numerous challenges, building up a vastly increased nuclear arsenal with no clear strategic purpose. How could the United States signal in advance its determination to retaliate with unacceptable damage against a nuclear attack if there were no way of identifying the attacker against whom we would then retaliate? Such an attack could be delivered by terrorists or in bombs exploded in ships of false national registry anchored in our harbors. Indeed, the objective could be to provoke us into nuclear war with the wrong nation.

Damage to our own civil liberties could hardly be avoided. National fright typically leads to a huge and pervasive police apparatus. Who can say that our democratic traditions would survive, considering how they have caved in under less pressure in the past?

This article will show that keeping countries from nuclear power technology, with its accompanying potential for producing nuclear weapons, could save money for the United States and preserve for the poor nations opportunities to improve standards of living and of education—opportunities otherwise lost because developing nations, even aided by the United States, cannot afford

both high-capital nuclear technology and better lives for their people.

Can the spread of nuclear weapons and technology be stopped—and stopped in time?

Underlying an answer to this question are three premises: (1) As far as technical knowledge is concerned, the genie is out of the bottle. (2) The countries with the ability to supply technicians, reactor hardware, and nuclear fuel have so many conflicting and even devious interests, that any anti-proliferation agreement must be at the mercy of the lowest common proliferator, with long delays and more loopholes than anti-proliferation clauses. (3) The consequences of nuclear weapon proliferation are so fraught with peril that efforts to contain it should go full speed ahead even though the superpowers can be blamed for asking others to refrain from producing "kilotonnage" when they cannot keep themselves from piling up "megatonnage." In any case, so urgent are the problems of both small country weapon proliferation and superpower expansion of existing nuclear arsenals that the efforts to cut back either one must proceed without waiting for a successful solution of the other.

In view of the difficulties of getting cooperation between nuclear and nonnuclear weapon states, are there steps to check proliferation that the United States can take unilaterally? Do unilateral steps preclude cooperative agreements later on? What are the obstacles, political and economic, domestic and international? What is the role of Congress in United States efforts? How willing is Congress to do anything really effective? And in time?

There are four classes of action that the United States can take to discourage nuclear proliferation. First, the United States can stop promoting and subsidizing nuclear power exports, keeping in mind that a nuclear power plant is the major step to nuclear weaponry. The engineers and physicists needed for nuclear explosives would be present in a power program. So also would be the plutonium, since the standard size 1,000 megawatt power reactor of current design would produce annually spent fuel containing 200 kilograms of plutonium—or enough for forty small nuclear explosive. All that is required to separate the plutonium from the radioactive wastes is a reprocessing plant which, for a modest weapons program, would require as few as eight engineers with standard training and would cost as little as \$25 million (a small fraction of a power reactor's cost).<sup>3</sup>

Second, the United States can move on many fronts to encourage the use of non-nuclear energy, thus providing better energy answers, economic and environmental. Nations insisting on going nuclear for military reasons could no longer wear the cloak of an energy solution.

Third, the United States can redirect its foreign aid away from nations which insist on developing nuclear explosives. Inasmuch as there can never be more than a tiny fraction of the foreign aid needed to go around, this redirection would be no more than good economics—allocating limited resources to those nations in which the aid will do the

most good for the least cost. No attempt to steer foreign aid away from less developed countries (LDCs) that use it to finance nuclear technology can ignore the fact that much American foreign aid goes out through multilateral development banks to such notorious proliferators as India. These institutions should be persuaded by the United States to deny loans to nations that are using the money directly or indirectly for nuclear proliferation. If American influence fails, we can reduce our contributions.<sup>4</sup>

Finally, at the same time the United States can press other nuclear suppliers to agree to stop proliferation. Our bids for cooperation would, if anything, be strengthened by the above-suggested demonstrations of good faith and good example.

#### UNITED STATES SUBSIDY OF NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION

Most states that have achieved a nuclear weapons capability, other than the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China, have benefited from promotion and direct and indirect subsidy by the United States Government.<sup>5</sup> The United States has promoted nuclear energy exports principally through the Export-Import Bank.

Since 1959, the Export-Import Bank has provided loans and guarantees for almost \$4.8 billion dollars of exports of nuclear equipment and fuel through sixty-eight loans totaling \$3.2 billion and thirty-four financial guarantees of \$1.6 billion in commercial bank lending.

Commercial banks, with Export-Import Bank guarantees, have provided a substantial portion of the funding—generally 40 to 45 percent, and typically are first to receive any repayment. In an industry-by-industry calculation for Fiscal Year 1975, the Congressional Budget Office concluded that the Export-Import Bank loans for nuclear exports, when compared with sixteen other industries, had the longest average terms and received the second highest proportion of subsidy.<sup>6</sup>

The Export-Import Bank has financed fifty of the sixty nuclear reactor exports by the United States; of the ten reactors exported without Export-Import Bank financing, only three exports of small reactors for Europe in the 1960s were not accompanied by some financial subsidy.<sup>7</sup> Subsidy has been critical to almost all American nuclear reactor exports.

The United States had provided many other forms of financial aid to foreign nuclear programs over the last twenty years. This assistance, totaling at least \$311.8 million as Table 2 shows, has been provided through the Atoms for Peace and other programs administered by the Atomic Energy Commission; through the Agency for International Development (AID); and through the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

By 1958, the Atomic Energy Commission had agreements governing American nuclear trade and cooperation in force or almost ratified with forty-three countries.<sup>8</sup> Under these agreements, the United States exported research reactors with nuclear fuel and training to Argentina, Brazil, Taiwan, Iran, Korea,

Footnotes at end of article.

Pakistan, Israel, and Spain—all now thought to be interested in having nuclear weapons.<sup>9</sup>

The cooperative research programs between the United States and the European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM) and between the United States and Canada involved assistance to Euratom and to the Canadian development of the CANDU heavy water reactor, but the expected benefits differed with each program. The goal of the United States-EURATOM Program, which included two of the four deferred-payment

nuclear fuel contracts (twenty-year loans at 4 percent interest including a ten-year grace period on principal repayments) was to persuade the Europeans to adopt American light-water reactor technology, so that American nuclear suppliers would benefit from exports; instead, it helped create the international competition which now threatens United States nuclear export markets. The goal of the United States-Canadian Program was to upgrade the quality of United States research in heavy water reactors by taking advantage of Canadian ex-

pertise.<sup>10</sup> Instead, the Canadian reactors also began to compete with United States exports.<sup>11</sup>

Most of the AID assistance to other nuclear programs has gone to India for the Tarapur nuclear power plant (92 percent of total AID nuclear assistance to India), but twenty-six countries have benefited from AID-financed nuclear training, reactor parts, nuclear material, and heavy water. The recipients have also included those reportedly near nuclear weapons: Israel, Korea, Pakistan, Spain, Taiwan, Iran, and Brazil.<sup>12</sup>

TABLE 1.—EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES: AUTHORIZATIONS FOR NUCLEAR POWERPLANTS AND TRAINING CENTER SUMMARY BY COUNTRY FROM INCEPTION THROUGH DEC. 31, 1976  
[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Country	Export value			Number of plants	Eximbank direct loans <sup>1</sup>			Loans	Eximbank financial guarantees			Number of guarantees
	Equipment	Fuel	Total		Equipment	Fuel	Total		Equipment	Fuel	Total	
Net authorizations:												
Argentina.....		\$18,853	\$18,853	1		\$13,466	\$13,466	1				
Brazil.....	\$164,162	27,572	191,734	1	\$137,753	17,527	155,280	1	\$4,996	\$3,644	\$8,640	1
France.....	11,220	5,030	16,250	1	11,220	5,030	16,250	1				
Germany.....	27,200	30,948	58,148	4	22,860	30,448	53,308	5				
Greece.....	3,000		3,000		1,275		1,275	1	1,275		1,275	1
Israel.....	650		650		485		485	2	135		135	1
Italy.....	75,759	26,796	102,555	2	70,851	24,849	95,700	2				
Japan.....	634,915	327,846	962,761	11	362,096	135,055	497,151	20	124,988	74,384	199,372	7
Korea.....	489,582	84,856	574,438	2	235,516	39,519	275,035	4	191,439	36,042	227,481	4
Mexico.....	202,663	37,000	239,663	2	111,528	24,930	136,458	4	53,145	8,370	61,515	2
Philippines.....	568,800	47,800	616,600	1	255,800	21,400	277,200	1	345,800	21,400	367,200	2
Romania.....	4,120	515	4,635		1,545	219	1,764	1	1,545	219	1,764	1
Spain.....	1,314,429	268,009	1,582,438	14	746,170	113,247	859,417	13	291,613	52,552	344,165	8
Taiwan.....	993,142	91,000	1,084,142	6	438,960	49,500	488,460	5	275,925	32,400	308,325	5
Sweden.....	44,700	37,935	82,635	4	20,115	20,070	40,185	4		6,570	6,570	1
Yugoslavia.....	173,577	22,000	195,577	1	185,692	19,800	205,492	2	29,337		29,337	1
Various European countries.....	90,250		90,250		90,250		90,250	1				
Total.....	4,798,169	1,025,960	5,824,129	50	2,692,116	515,060	3,207,176	68	1,320,198	235,581	1,555,779	34

<sup>1</sup> Direct Export-Import Bank loans have had the following terms: (1) Total repayment period has been about 20 yr with no principal repayment during the reactor construction period which has increased from 3-4 yr in the 1960's to 8-9 yr today; (2) interest rates have ranged from 4.5 percent

in the late 1940's to 8 3/4 percent in 1976 with the majority of loans (37 of 63) at a 6 percent interest rate.

Source: Export-Import Bank.

TABLE 2.—OTHER U.S. AID TO NUCLEAR PROGRAMS, 1953-77

Program	Purpose	Funding/number of countries
AEC Atoms for Peace (1953-62).....	Grants for research reactors.....	\$9 million (26).
	Grants for research equipment.....	\$2.7 million (19).
United States-Euratom, joint research program (1959-69).....	To encourage Europe to adopt U.S. reactor technology.....	\$28 million (6).
AEC deferred-payment fuel contracts (1962-65).....	Part of United States-Euratom joint research program.....	\$88.8 million (3).
United States-Canada joint research program.....	Share research on heavy water reactor technology.....	\$6 million (1).
A.I.D. (1962-74).....	Capital, technical, and program assistance.....	\$83.3 million (27) (of this amount, \$72 million went to India for the Tarapur reactors).
U.S. contributions to the IAEA (1958-77).....	Promotion of peaceful uses of nuclear energy.....	\$93.1 million (estimate of U.S. contributions for nonsafeguards activities—80 percent of total U.S. contributions).
Various activities (1953-present).....	International nuclear training, educational programs, conferences and exhibits.....	No funding data available.
Total additional U.S. contributions to other countries' nuclear programs.....		\$310.9 million.

Sources: "U.S. Financial Assistance in the Development of Foreign Nuclear Energy Programs," General Accounting Office, May 28, 1975; Bureau of International Organizations, Department of State; Division of International Affairs, Energy Research and Development Administration.

United States support for the IAEA has helped substantially to spread nuclear technology, in spite of the supposed safeguards. Although the IAEA was conceived by President Eisenhower as a repository of all the world's nuclear weapon material in order to reduce pressure for proliferation,<sup>13</sup> most of its budget and activities since 1958 have gone to promote nuclear activities; its safeguard function is understaffed and underfunded.<sup>14</sup>

Furthermore, the United States has trained almost 13,500 foreign nationals since 1945 in nuclear physics and related fields. As part of our contribution toward creating the world's newest nuclear power, since 1955 the United States has trained 1,367 Indian technicians.<sup>15</sup>

Between 1970 and 1975, the United States trained nearly 1,500 nationals of forty-one countries in nuclear reactor technology, plutonium recycle/reprocessing, uranium enrichment, and related crucial disciplines, the overwhelming majority (1,300) for nations with sophisticated nuclear programs and therefore technically near nuclear explosive capability. Table 3 provides a breakdown by

country and category (showing proximity to explosive capabilities) of the numbers receiving training:

Particularly significant for weapons development is that the United States trained scientists for seven nations in plutonium recycling/reprocessing, including Taiwan, Spain, and India.

TABLE 3. Training of Foreign Personnel in the United States (1970-76)

[In reactor technology, plutonium recycle/reprocessing uranium enrichment and related disciplines]

National	Number of nationals trained
Category O/O+ (Nations which have nuclear weapons/explosives):	
France.....	38
Great Britain.....	27
India.....	22
U.S.S.R.....	3

Category I (Nations with full access to weapons-grade material and with broad-based technology support):

Belgium.....	6
Canada.....	6

Germany (West).....	155
Italy.....	127
Japan.....	281
Netherlands.....	7
South Africa.....	4
Sweden.....	16
Taiwan.....	355

Category II (Nations with limited weapons-grade material sources and some nuclear technology program):

Argentina.....	7
Australia.....	8
Brazil.....	72
Czechoslovakia.....	1
Egypt.....	8
Iran.....	33
Israel.....	11
Korea (ROK).....	11
Mexico.....	90
Norway.....	1
Pakistan.....	4
Spain.....	65
Switzerland.....	95

Category III (Remainder of nations):

Algeria.....	3
Austria.....	8
Chile.....	4

Footnotes at end of article.



TABLE 3. Training of Foreign Personnel in the United States (1970-75)—Continued

Nation	Number of nationals trained
Category III (Remainder of nations):—Con.	
Denmark	3
Finland	1
Greece	3
Hong Kong	1
Ireland	1
Jordan	1
Libya	1
Nigeria	2
Saudi Arabia	1
Syria	1
Thailand	1
Turkey	8
Vietnam (South)	2
Total	1,489

Sources: "List of Foreign Nationals Trained in Selected Disciplines at AEC/ERDA Facilities," Jan. 1, 1970-December 13, 1975, provided to Rep. Clarence D. Long by Nelson F. Slevering, Jr., Assistant Administrator for International Affairs, ERDA, September 3, 1976.

Categories derived from *Moving Toward Life in a Nuclear Armed Crowd*, Albert

Footnotes at end of article.

Wohlstetter et al., Report prepared for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency by Pan Heuristics, Inc., (April 22, 1976), pp. 39-42.

Table printed in *Congressional Record*, September 22, 1976, pg. H-10856.

The India case illustrates the "wrong-headedness" of American policy. More than ten years ago, India was known to have a reprocessing plant not under international safeguards, but the AEC recommended nevertheless that the United States provide "encouragement and assistance toward the recycle of plutonium produced in India's nuclear power plants," at the same time making the Orwellian assertion that such help was "of direct pertinence to encouragement of peaceful uses and deterrence of military uses."<sup>16</sup> The reverse, of course, was true; the weapons-grade plutonium that comes from reprocessing can as well be used for nuclear explosives as for nuclear fuel.<sup>17</sup>

Concern over continuing the American training of foreign nationals in nuclear technology led the House of Representatives during the consideration of the Export Administration Act Amendment (H.R. 15377) in September 1976, to adopt the Fraser-Long amendment, calling for a six-month study by the Executive Branch on the extent to which—

"the education and training of foreign nationals within the United States in nuclear engineering and related fields contribute to

the proliferation of explosive nuclear devices or the development of a capability of producing explosive nuclear devices."<sup>18</sup> Ford Administration opposition prevented the Senate from going to conference and the provision was not enacted.

To illustrate the crucial role played by the United States in underwriting the spread of nuclear technology around the world, Table 4 lists five categories of American aid given to twenty-two low-income near-nuclear countries.

Nuclear power has been further disseminated around the world by the United States subsidy of its domestic nuclear industry. The large accumulations of spent nuclear fuel which may be reprocessed into plutonium intensifies the threat of weapons spread. Thus, the United States has sent abroad the doubtful word that nuclear power is a most modern and inevitable form of energy. Worse, the creation of a sizable nuclear industry has set in place powerful interests among industry, labor, and the universities that bitterly oppose any nuclear restraints as a threat to their investments, their jobs, and their consulting fees. The nuclear industry, the Atomic Energy Commission (now the Energy Research and Development Administration), and the Joint Atomic Energy Committee have so far stymied efforts to restrain nuclear proliferation. Domestic subsidies have ranged from direct government expenditures, to tax breaks, to below-cost charges for nuclear fuel and waste disposal.

TABLE 4

Country <sup>1</sup>	Ex-Im Bank (millions)		AEC assistance (thousands) <sup>2</sup>	Sensitive material supplied <sup>3</sup>	AID funding (thousands) <sup>4</sup>	Personnel trained <sup>5</sup>	Country <sup>1</sup>	Ex-Im Bank (millions)		AEC assistance (thousands) <sup>2</sup>	Sensitive material supplied <sup>3</sup>	AID funding (thousands) <sup>4</sup>	Personnel trained <sup>5</sup>
	Direct loans	Guarantees						Direct loans	Guarantees				
Argentina			\$462 L			220	Philippines	277.0	367.0	S		447	149
Brazil	\$155.0	\$9.0	364 L		\$66	155	Portugal			350 L			30
Colombia			402 S			104	South Africa			L			94
Egypt					4	103	South Korea	275.0	227.0	350 S		87	272
Greece	1.0	1.0	477 L		170	194	Spain	859.0	344.0	350 L		194	1,052
India			16,780 L		76,326	1,367	Taiwan	488.0	308.0	448 L		33	1,052
Indonesia			350 S		141	87	Thailand			350 S		267	81
Iran			350 S		36	162	Turkey			350 S		451	145
Israel	5	1	350 L		80	358	Venezuela			350 S		6	75
Mexico	136.0	61.0	159 S			149	Vietnam			350 S			49
Pakistan			350 L		1,675	135	Yugoslavia	205.0	29.0	350 S		104	128

<sup>1</sup> The list of countries was derived from the Wohlstetter Report, "Moving Toward Life in a Nuclear Armed Crowd," pp. 36-37 and 39-40. Several countries which had received research reactors from the United States, were also included. Most European and developed nations were not included in order to provide a list of the small, lower-income countries generally discussed as the most likely new nuclear powers. South Africa is not a low-income country but was included because it is often mentioned as interested in developing nuclear weapons.

<sup>2</sup> AEC assistance was provided under the atoms-for-peace program and included grants for research reactors and other nuclear research equipment.

<sup>3</sup> Sensitive material includes uranium with 20 percent or more uranium-235, plutonium, uranium-233, and heavy water. The designation "L" signifies a large quantity of sensitive material, and the designation "S" signifies a small quantity. The significance of uranium-235, uranium-233, and plutonium is that all three substances can be used to make nuclear weapons. The significance of heavy water is that it can be used as a moderator in a reactor fueled with natural uranium, which is easier to obtain than enriched uranium fuel. India used a heavy-water-moderated research reactor to obtain the plutonium for its nuclear explosive, and the United States provided 10 tons heavy water for that reactor. If a country received more than 10 kilograms of uranium with 20 per-

cent or more uranium-235 or more than 10 tons of heavy water, it was designated "L". If not, it was designated "S". No country received more than 700 grams of plutonium or more than 5 grams of uranium-233.

<sup>4</sup> AID funding includes capital assistance and technical assistance financing of foreign nuclear energy projects and activities cumulative as of Sept. 30, 1974, and also, program assistance financing of nuclear equipment and materials from July 1968 to June 1974. AID has not funded foreign nuclear programs since 1974.

<sup>5</sup> Personnel trained from 1955 to date. Data from Office of Assistant Administrator for International Affairs, ERDA, February 1977.

Source: Export-Import Bank. "U.S. Financial Assistance in the Development of Foreign Nuclear Energy Programs." General Accounting Office, report No. ID-75-63, (May 28, 1975). Export Reorganization Act of 1976, hearings of the Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate, 94th Cong., 2d sess., on S. 1439, p. 18-19 and p. 813. Letter Feb. 2, 1977, from Norman H. Brand, Chief, Visits and Assignments Branch, Office of International Program Implementation, International Affairs Division, ERDA.

#### THE PAST ROLE OF CONGRESS

The "peaceful" nuclear explosive detonated by India in May 1974 aroused the House of Representatives to a spate of legislative activity, including the passage of an amendment to the International Development Association (IDA) Authorization bill requiring the United States representatives to the International Development Association to vote against any loans to India.<sup>19</sup> At about the same time, the House passed (194 to 191) an amendment to the International Nuclear Agreements Congressional Review Act (H.R. 15582), requiring prior congressional approval of all nuclear agreements. The amendment was thrown out in the House-Senate Conference of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee (a mock conference in which the Committee met with itself), even though the Senate had almost passed a similar amendment.<sup>20</sup>

The Indian explosion prompted other bills, amendments, and statements on the House and Senate floors. The FY 1975 Foreign Aid Authorization bill, passed in December 1974 and now public law, contained a provision

prohibiting the use of funds for nuclear reactors or nuclear reactor fuel for Egypt or Israel. Also included in the 1975 authorization was an amendment earmarking funds for the much-needed strengthening of IAEA safeguards.<sup>21</sup>

These modest steps paved the way for a heightened sensitivity to nuclear proliferation in the last months of the 94th Congress. Environmentalists and public interest groups set out to awaken the public and alert key Congressmen and Senators to the danger. In March 1976, Representative Richard Ottinger took the lead in criticizing continued United States nuclear fuel shipments to India. His efforts and those of interested organizations resulted in the first public hearings (July 1976) on a United States nuclear export license. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission suspended further nuclear fuel shipments to India until more effective nuclear safeguards could be devised.

Any efforts by Congress to stop promoting nuclear energy/weapon proliferation owed nothing to its leadership, the Ford Administration, or to the Joint Committee on

Atomic Energy. This Committee, the only joint committee of Congress with legislative authority, sought to block or gut every congressional attempt at strong nonproliferation measures, thus continuing to demonstrate that it was more responsive to the industry and to the Executive than to the Congress. Indeed, until March 1976, the Joint Committee had held only one hearing on nuclear proliferation in five years, and, of the seven nuclear export measures reported by the Joint Committee between 1971 and 1976, five authorized increases in exports and none undertook seriously to limit exports.

In the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations under the leadership of Senator Abraham Ribicoff, undertook a two-year effort to draft legislation to combat nuclear proliferation. The Joint Atomic Energy Committee opposed Ribicoff's effort under the guise of jurisdictional questions. The Government Operations Committee's work during 1975 and 1976 was largely responsible for the drafting of S. 3770 (H.R. 15273), the Nuclear Explosive Proliferation Control Act of 1976, which set forth a com-

prehensive national proliferation policy.<sup>23</sup> Senator Stuart Symington succeeded in adding to the International Security Assistance and Arms Control Export Act of 1976 an amendment to cut off foreign aid to countries receiving sensitive nuclear fuel reprocessing or enrichment facilities; however, the amendment was weakened in House-Senate Conference to allow the President to waive the prohibition on aid under certain circumstances.<sup>24</sup>

Increasing disenchantment with the Joint Committee in 1976 was indicated in the House by the support generated by the Long proposal to set up a Select Committee on Nuclear Proliferation and Nuclear Export Policy. House Resolution 951 had 143 House sponsors, including Morris Udall, John Brademas, Philip Burton, and Peter Rodino, and the endorsements of the many national organizations concerned over nuclear proliferation.<sup>25</sup>

In the final days of the 94th Congress, the Joint Committee killed two bills which had been reported favorably by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate Government Operations Committee. The version of the Nuclear Explosive Proliferation Control Act of 1976 (H.R. 15419) reported by the Joint Committee was gutted by Administration amendments accepted in the Joint Committee without debate.<sup>26</sup>

The 94th Congress adjourned on October 1, 1976, without enacting any of the following nonproliferation proposals:

Four related bills (S. 3770, two versions of H.R. 15419, and the Percy substitute for S. 3770) to establish a national nonproliferation policy with supporting international negotiations and limitations on American nuclear exports.

An amendment to the ERDA Authorization bill (Sec. 201 of H.R. 13350) to restrict the export of enriched uranium to countries that have not ratified the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

An attempt to add nuclear export limitations and restrictions on nuclear fuel reprocessing to the Export Administration Act Amendments (the Zablocki-Findley provision, Section 18 of H.R. 15537).

An amendment (Fraser-Long amendment) to the Export Administration Act Amendments which had passed the House, to require a study of American nuclear training of foreign nationals.

House Resolution 951 to establish a House Select Committee on Nuclear Proliferation and Nuclear Export Policy.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy had come to be seen as a major roadblock to a strong policy of nuclear export restraint. After the close of the 94th Congress, retirements and defeats greatly altered the Joint Committee's make-up, especially on the Senate side, and set the stage, along with the recommendation of the Senate Committee on Committees, for further action to curb its power.

To do this, Representative Jonathan Bingham (D-NY), with my help and that of Representative Ottinger and others, led a successful fight in the 95th Democratic Caucus of early December 1976 to amend the House rules to strip legislative authority from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and transfer its jurisdiction to several standing committees in the House, with the nuclear export responsibilities going to the Committee on International Relations. This action was ratified by the full House when it convened on January 4, 1977.

LEGISLATIVE FOR THE 95TH CONGRESS TO END EXPORT PROMOTION

Major reforms, based on the stronger bills from the 94th Congress are now being drafted,<sup>27</sup> and action can be expected on those bills as well as on several bilateral

nuclear agreements and on certain applications for export licenses now pending before the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

The following is an outline of nine general legislative proposals to insure that nuclear exports from the United States do not get financial assistance from the Government.

1. Amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 to prohibit loans or guarantees for nuclear reactors, fuel, heavy water, or other nuclear related items.

2. Amend the Foreign Assistance Act to deny aid to any country to purchase nuclear reactors, fuel, and technology, and to deny guarantees or insurance (such as those of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation) for the same purpose.

3. Amend the Foreign Assistance Act, the Export-Import Bank Act, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act (Food for Peace Program), the Arms Export Control Act, the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, and any other aid legislation to reduce the foreign aid credits, or guarantees, to the extent that the recipient country is spending on expanding its nuclear power capacity. Such action would prevent our foreign aid and other resources from being used indirectly to finance nuclear exports (through the fundability of foreign exchange and financial resources).

4. Instruct the American representatives to the multilateral development banks and to United Nations aid programs to oppose aid to countries with expanding nuclear programs and to advocate that the banks advise against nuclear power. Investigate the desirability of ending American contributions to the multilateral development banks and United Nations aid programs if such policies against nuclear power are not adopted.

5. Enact legislation requiring a study of the effect of American nuclear training of foreign nationals at government facilities or in private universities on the spread of nuclear weapons. Amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to require the full cost of such training to be paid by the government whose national is to be trained.

6. Investigate the extent to which American nuclear firms are supporting foreign subsidiaries either by supplying nuclear reactors for their foreign home markets or in exporting American-licensed nuclear technology to third countries.

7. Provide the Nuclear Regulatory Commission with power to license the transfer by American businesses of nuclear technology or know-how. Further require that public hearings on such transfers to other countries be held if requested and that the Congress receive sixty-day notice of such transfers, during which the Congress could act to disapprove.

8. Instruct the Executive Branch to propose that the IAEA separate the funding of promotional and safeguards activities with a view to confining all United States funding to the safeguards budget.

9. Amend Title V of the Trade Act of 1974, which provides preferences for developing countries, to prohibit duty-free treatment for goods of any developing countries which expand their nuclear power programs.

Ending all these government subsidies would not, of course, forbid private financing. It is difficult however, to see how private financing would long continue without subsidies in view of the doubtful profit prospects. For those who profess faith that the profits are there, but perhaps hidden or in the future, here is a chance to prove that faith by putting up their own money.

A major objection certain to be raised against curbing United States subsidy of nuclear energy/weapon proliferation is its economic cost. This bears some resemblance to the objection that abolishing disease will have an adverse economic impact on doctors and nurses. Elimination of nuclear prolifera-

tion would in any case, be desirable, even without the nuclear weapon issue, simply because nuclear power is economically inappropriate for developing nations, as will be noted below.

#### APPROPRIATE ENERGY SOURCES FOR DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

For many reason, nuclear power is economically inappropriate for developing countries:

1. Nuclear power requires excessive amounts of capital and managerial skill, both of which are expensive and in short supply in the developing world.

2. Nuclear power diverts scarce resources from roads, schools, hospitals, irrigation projects, fertilizers, agricultural implements, and housing.

3. Nuclear power lures the poor countries—as it does the rich—from the search for energy sources (including renewable ones) which are less costly in capital and less damaging to the environment.

4. Nuclear power is centrally generated, and, without additional large capital expenditures, cannot be distributed to the rural poor, who are scattered over wide distances and often over rugged terrain.

5. The average nuclear power plant—1,000 megawatts—is too large for the electric grids of most developing nations and, if shut down, could not be replaced readily by auxiliary power sources.<sup>28</sup> So many energy eggs in one basket makes the power supply vulnerable to sabotage or breakdown, especially in view of the shortage of highly skilled maintenance personnel.

If nuclear energy is economically inappropriate for developing countries, what then are the alternatives? Waiting in the wings are numerous energy sources which do not lead to apocalyptic weaponry and which, if not discouraged by price policies and heavy subsidies that drain factors of production away to nuclear power, may be competitive and environmentally sound solutions to the energy problem. To accomplish this objective, a rural development strategy is needed which focuses on the use of simple, inexpensive, labor-using tools and techniques that are appropriate to the scarcity of capital and the abundance of labor in poor countries. These tools and techniques, described by others variously as "intermediate" or "appropriate," or "village," I call "light capital technologies."<sup>29</sup> Light capital energy technologies are small-scale, low-cost, simple, reliable, repairable with semi-skilled labor; and produced from local, renewable resources (such as sun, wind, flowing water, and vegetation). In some parts of the world, energy is already being provided from these non-polluting, renewable sources, through the use of devices such as: (1) small, water-powered turbines or hydraulic rams for pumping water, for providing mechanical energy, or for generating electricity;<sup>30</sup> (2) windmills to pump drinking and irrigation water; to crush sugar cane, thresh or grind grain, shell peanuts; and to power small electric generators; (3) bio-gas or methane plants to fuel irrigation pumps and other engines, and to produce organic fertilizers as substitutes for more expensive chemicals; and (4) solar energy collectors to heat water, or dry crops for storage.

Energy, like a penny, is as good saved as produced, and the developing world like the United States, is wasting it as if it were still cheap. Methods for saving energy in rural areas of developing societies include:

More efficient cooking stoves, pots, and methods to reduce burning of wood, crop residues, and dung.

Improved clothing, blankets, and shelter to reduce heating-fuel consumption.

Organization of human labor, sharing of draft animals to break labor bottlenecks at planting, weeding, harvesting, and threshing

Footnotes at end of article.



time, in order to make optimum use of available animate energy.

Replacing energy-intensive chemical fertilizers with natural and organic fertilizers.

Use of drip irrigation with earthen pots and pipes which reduce the amount of water required—and the energy required to move it.<sup>30</sup>

It should be noted, however, that many developing nations—such as Argentina, India, Pakistan, the Philippines, Turkey, Korea, Mexico, Zaire, Angola, Morocco, Brazil and other countries of Latin America—possess unexploited fossil fuel (oil, natural gas, coal, oil shale and tar sands) as well as geothermal and hydroelectric resources sufficient for their own energy needs.<sup>31</sup>

The encouragement of light capital energy technologies must be institutionalized.<sup>32</sup> A World Energy Conference could be a forum to convince developing nations to move away from nuclear power, to plan for replacing nuclear and capital-intensive energy sources with light capital energy technologies, and to explore foreign aid as a means of nudging developing countries toward light capital technology and away from nuclear power.<sup>33</sup>

Needed especially are credit organizations available in the villages, coupled with extension systems to show local people how to adapt, use, and repair the energy sources. To accomplish this institutionalization, use could be made of the Kissinger proposal of 1975 for an International Energy Institute.

Congress can provide leadership in specific, yet undoubtedly controversial, ways:

1. Earmark funds for ERDA's Cooperative Research and Development Program with Developing Countries.

2. Direct the Appropriate Technology Fund, now beginning its work, to undertake demonstration or pilot projects in light capital energy sources and technologies.

3. Earmark foreign aid funds (under AID and other programs) for light capital energy projects, with emphasis on the creation of country and regional light capital energy institutes.

4. Enact guidelines for United States foreign aid programs to provide incentives for poor countries to cooperate with United States anti-proliferation policies, to eschew nuclear power and to adopt light capital energy.

5. Direct American representatives to the multilateral development banks and to other international organizations to stress light capital energy policies and projects.<sup>34</sup>

#### OBJECTIONS THAT WILL BE RAISED TO THE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

**Objection: Poor nations must have nuclear power to replace oil imports and save foreign exchange.**

Response: Nuclear power offers the prospect not of relieving shortages of foreign exchange and capital in poor nations but of exacerbating them. Nuclear power requires enormous capital—approximately \$1 billion in capital construction costs for a 1,000 megawatt reactor, substantially more than for coal or oil-powered plants of that output.<sup>35</sup> Reactor parts, highly skilled technicians, and nuclear fuel would have to be imported at additional foreign exchange cost; whereas more conventional power plants could use indigenous factors of production.

Furthermore, if the bill to develop nuclear power in the underdeveloped nations is paid by the United States it would be at the expense of aid for food production, irrigation, and fertilizer, roads, education, health, ports, and housing. To construct the projected nuclear capacity for urban India alone in 1990 (not counting annual fuel costs) would require about \$20 billion,<sup>36</sup> and this immense sum would do nothing for the energy needs of the rural poor who make up four-fifths of the Indian population and who represent the

real reason for seeking economic development.

Some of the oil-producing nations claim they need nuclear power to replace their oil when it gives out; but with oil for decades, they have time to seek out non-nuclear solutions and should certainly not get our subsidies to go the nuclear power route. If the oil-rich nations nevertheless choose to go the nuclear route to get to nuclear weaponry, they should have to use their own wealth.

**Objection: If the United States stops subsidizing nuclear exports, other nations will take over the nuclear market.**

Response: The threat of abandoning the nuclear market to other suppliers would be more formidable if the nuclear market were lucrative.<sup>37</sup> Those who claim it is profitable should be asked to substantiate their contention. Even the French may ultimately get the message that nuclear exports have a way of costing the taxpayers more than the industry earns in profits. If France, Germany, or any other nation chooses to lose money, or to give away its resources to other countries, this is hardly reason for us to follow its example.<sup>38</sup> In any case, with our efforts subtracted from the others, the proliferation of reactors would presumably be less, and anything that reduces nuclear proliferation of reactors is of course a gain. As Albert Wohlstetter has suggested, better less than more and better later than sooner.<sup>39</sup>

Moreover there is some chance that United States leadership combined with economic and political pressure could bring other countries to cooperate. Chancellor Schmidt of West Germany has said that he was not aware of any official American displeasure with the German-Brazilian nuclear deal.<sup>40</sup> United States pressure forced South Korea to rescind its order for a French reprocessing plant. The French have recently agreed to stronger nuclear export controls; the Canadians have gone further in their controls than the French,<sup>41</sup> and the Soviet Union reportedly agrees with the stronger Canadian restraints.<sup>42</sup> Further, the major nuclear exporters—France and Germany—depend on American enriched nuclear fuel to keep their domestic power reactors going if they continue to divert their own fuel for export.<sup>43</sup> There are other avenues of economic pressure—such as American influence in the International Monetary Fund to affect loans to countries in balance of payments difficulties, food exports, and capital restrictions. What evidence is there that the levers at our disposal cannot be made to work, if we use them in good faith?

It is even possible that clear American leadership and example will be supplemented by the burgeoning opposition to nuclear power in many developed countries, including a number of the nuclear exporting nations. Sweden's recently elected Prime Minister, Thorbjörn Fälldin, promised to dismantle his country's nuclear program, if elected; he has just presented legislation to the Swedish Parliament that severely restricts future nuclear power development. A British Royal Commission chaired by Sir Brian Flowers, a member of Britain's Atomic Energy Authority, recently recommended against development of fast breeder nuclear reactors—which produce huge amounts of weapons grade plutonium—in favor of development of alternative, nonnuclear, energy sources. France and West Germany have had sit-ins, mass demonstrations, and instances of sabotage at nuclear sites, and West Germany and Switzerland face legal fights over reactor construction. Denmark, Norway, and the Netherlands are having second thoughts about expanding their nuclear power capacity.<sup>44</sup>

**Objection: It is too late to stop nuclear proliferation.**

Response: Although the spread of nuclear reactors and weaponry has been allowed to

go too far, proliferation has just begun. Preventing any nation from going nuclear will preserve neighboring nations from the fierce internal political pressures to do likewise, out of fear. Examples of nations seeking to keep up with the nation next door are Egypt as a result of Israel, Pakistan as a result of India, and Brazil as a result of Argentina. Any nuclear moves we can abort now can head off some multiple of these moves in the years to come.

Tough as is the nuclear lobby now, it will get tougher, if the industry is allowed to multiply here and abroad. Anybody who has tried to resist the national defense lobby with its firms and workers in nearly every congressional district and its highly paid consultants in universities, will appreciate the urgency of acting before the political clout of the nuclear industry approaches the dimensions of that of the defense industry.

**Objection: Ending nuclear export subsidies will jeopardize thousands of American jobs.**

Response: So far as job creation is concerned, there are two objections to nuclear exports as a source of employment. First the nuclear industry, being capital intensive, furnishes few jobs and the highly-skilled, highly-paid people it does employ are not, for the most part, this nation's main unemployment problem. Digging holes and refilling them to make work is good economics in comparison with subsidizing an industry that could lead to the destruction of much of mankind, if the only purpose is to provide a few thousand jobs.

The fact is that there are virtually trillions of dollars of projects vitally needed in this nation that offer exciting employment prospects, conditional only on first solving the inflationary effects: housing, mass transit, health care, education (including special education for the handicapped and the gifted), pollution, abatement, flood control, helping the aged. So far as inflation is concerned, any of these avenues of job creation would lead to less cost and price increase than the nuclear industry.

If the United States withdraws nuclear export subsidies, how will this money get to the providers of employment? With these funds no longer extracted from the American capital markets, investment money will become available on somewhat easier terms to the nonnuclear types of job creation. More jobs can be created in other industries where less capital is needed per worker, including industries producing other types of energy, than there would be jobs lost from diminished nuclear exports.

**Objection: Nuclear export subsidies are needed to shore up an unfavorable United States balance-of-payments.**

Response: It makes little sense to remedy an unfavorable balance-of-payments by creating terrifying long term problems, even if the unfavorable balance were large, and even if it could be remedied in this manner. In fact, nuclear exports are scarcely 1 percent of total United States exports,<sup>45</sup> substantially smaller than the statistical error in computing the balance of payments. In any case, there is a question whether subsidizing nuclear exports could help the balance of payments. At least one economist has argued that subsidizing an export produces no overall increase in exports, but simply increases imports by the same amount, and thus decreases employment in the import substitution.<sup>46</sup> My own reasoning is that subsidizing one kind of export also tends, by raising factor costs, to be at the expense of other exports, again without improving the total.

#### CONCLUSION

It is my conviction that the greatest danger confronting the balance of this century is nuclear weapons proliferation among nations; that the major impetus to nuclear power and weaponry has been United States subsidy and promotion; that past Congresses

Footnotes at end of article.

abandoned leadership to the President and the Joint Atomic Energy Committee; that the United States Congress can act during this session to stop this subsidy and promotion; and that ending the subsidy of nuclear proliferation would be wise economically and environmentally.

I emphasize this economic justification because it is so often argued that if the United States stops subsidizing nuclear proliferation, other supplier countries will move in to fill the vacuum. Reasons have been cited here to suggest that other nations are seeing the folly of doing this and could see the folly even more clearly if the United States took leadership in pointing the way. But, if other nations insist on promoting nuclear proliferation, there will obviously be less than if we, the world's largest proliferator, continue in our wrong-headed policy.

The legislative efforts to stop this promotion were begun in the 94th Congress but can proceed in the 95th, one hopes, under the leadership of President Carter, who has spoken strongly on this issue. The measures will be admittedly drastic, but there is no other hope. Proposals to wait for agreement among other supplier nations are proposals not to do anything, since any agreement will be at the mercy of the least common denominator, with numerous loopholes and long delays. The longer the delays, the more the proliferation to additional nations. The more nations with nuclear weapons, the harder to get agreement. Similarly, the larger the nuclear industry, in the United States and elsewhere, the more formidable the political lobby.

The main obstacles to stopping nuclear proliferation will in fact be political pressure groups. To counter them will require arousing the American people to the imperatives of the proliferation issue. If there is one thing I have learned in fourteen years in Congress, it is that the finest oratory on the floor of the Congress is as nothing compared to a flood of letters from the folks back home. But such grass roots pressure requires arousing the public—scarcely easy in view of the complexity of the issue and the distasteful vision of the future that people are asked to ponder.

There is the risk, of course, that if the public becomes sufficiently frightened to demand that something be done, the result might be over-reaction. Democracy does not function well in a state of panic. All the more reason to deal with the problem now while it is still manageable and can still be debated in an atmosphere of calm reason.

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> See the discussion in Albert Wohlstetter et al., *Moving Toward Life in a Nuclear Armed Crowd?*, Report prepared for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA/PAB-263) by Pan Heuristics Division of Science Applications, Inc., (Los Angeles, California) Chapter 2, especially pp. 36-41.

<sup>2</sup> Industrial nations, such as Japan (if Korea got nuclear weapons) might join in the nuclear arms race.

<sup>3</sup> See Wohlstetter et al., *Moving Toward Life in a Nuclear Armed Crowd?*, especially pp. 25-26 and 35. Also, note his article in *Foreign Policy*, No. 25 (Winter 1977). For further reference see John R. Lamarsh, "On the Extraction of Plutonium from Reactor Fuel by Small and/or Developing Nations." Report prepared for the Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress, July 1976, pp. 11, 18, 19.

<sup>4</sup> The Long amendment to the International Development Association Act, which passed the House on July 2, 1974 and has become law, requires the United States to vote against any loan to any country "which develops any nuclear explosive device, unless the country is or becomes a State Party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nu-

clear Weapons." See Section 3 of Public Law 93-373.

<sup>5</sup> Of 113 nuclear power reactors exported, the U.S. has exported 60; thus, the U.S. has exported more power reactors than all other nuclear supplier nations put together. Data from "Nuclear Power Plants Outside the U.S.," Atomic Industrial Forum, May 1, 1976. Reactors operating, under construction, or ordered were included as exports under this calculation.

<sup>6</sup> "The Export-Import Bank: Implications for the Federal Budget and the Credit Market," Staff Working Paper, Congressional Budget Office, October 27, 1976, pg. 17.

<sup>7</sup> *Nuclear Proliferation: Future U.S. Foreign Policy Implications*, Hearings before the Subcommittee on International Security and Scientific Affairs of the Committee on International Relations, House of Representatives, Ninety-Fourth Congress, First Session, pg. 100.

<sup>8</sup> Warren H. Donnelly, *Commercial Nuclear Power in Europe: The Interaction of American Diplomacy with a New Technology*, Science Policy Research Division, Congressional Research Service, December 1972, pg. 32.

<sup>9</sup> "U.S. Financial Assistance in the Development of Foreign Nuclear Energy Programs," General Accounting Office (Report ID-75-63), May 28, 1975, pg. 10.

<sup>10</sup> Division of International Affairs, Energy Research and Development Administration, January 5, 1977.

<sup>11</sup> The Canadian CANDU reactors also have complicated anti-proliferation efforts because their continuous refueling makes them more difficult to safeguard than U.S. type reactors. See answer by the Department of State to question 11 of Senator Glenn, *Export Reorganization Act of 1976*, Hearings before the Committee on Government Operations, United States Senate, Ninety-Fourth Congress, Second Session on S. 1439, pg. 845.

<sup>12</sup> "U.S. Financial Assistance in the Development of Foreign Nuclear Energy Programs," *Export Reorganization Act*, pg. 10.

<sup>13</sup> Donnelly, *Commercial Nuclear Power in Europe*, pg. 47.

<sup>14</sup> According to the table, "Summary of Estimated Programme Resources 1977," by the International Atomic Energy Agency, the safeguards budget accounts for only 18% of the regular budget and only 14% of "total estimated resources."

For additional discussion of the International Atomic Energy Agency, see the following sources:

Hearings of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, FY 1977, Part 2, pp. 577-597. See especially pg. 578 and the statement by Ambassador Gerald Tape, U.S. Representative to the International Atomic Energy Agency, that the IAEA, as of April 1976, would have 50 inspectors to inspect 400 nuclear installations.

*Export Reorganization Act of 1976*, pp. 533-756 and related appendices. See especially testimony of J. Kenneth Fasick, Director, International Division, General Accounting Office, pp. 537-548.

<sup>15</sup> Letter February 2, 1977 from International Affairs Division, ERDA.

<sup>16</sup> Abraham S. Friedman and Myron B. Kratzer, "Visit of Indian AEC Chairman and Thorium and Accelerator Teams," Atomic Energy Commission memorandum, September 1966, Exhibit E of the Submission of the Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc., The Sierra Club and the Union of Concerned Scientists for the July 20, 1976 hearing on the Proposed Export of Special Nuclear Material to India, before the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

<sup>17</sup> Furthermore, with trained scientists, even if the reprocessing were done outside of

the recipient country (such as in a multinational reprocessing facility), and only fuel rods containing mixture of plutonium and uranium were imported, the recipient country could still separate the plutonium from the mixed-oxide fuel rods and could do so more quickly and inexpensively than if it had to reprocess irradiated fuel. See Albert Wohlstetter, "Spreading the Bomb Without Quite Breaking the Rules," *Foreign Policy*, No. 25 (Winter 1977).

<sup>18</sup> *Congressional Record*, September 22, 1976, pg. 31959.

<sup>19</sup> *Congressional Record*, July 2, 1974, pg. 22029, Rep. Clarence D. Long's amendment to H.R. 15465.

<sup>20</sup> *Congressional Record*, July 10, 1974, pg. 22587, amendment offered by Senator Proxmire to S. 3698 (H.R. 15582). For Long amendment to H.R. 15582, see *Congressional Record*, July 31, 1974, pg. 26144 and 26153, and *Congressional Record*, August 20, 1974, pg. 26153-26155.

<sup>21</sup> "Foreign Assistance Act of 1974," Public Law 93-559, enacted December 30, 1974, Section 9(a)(1)(g) and Section 43.

<sup>22</sup> See the following sources:

*The Export Reorganization Act—1975*, Hearings before the Committee on Government Operations, United States Senate, Ninety-Fourth Congress, First Session; *The Export Reorganization Act of 1976*; and *Peaceful Nuclear Exports and Weapons Proliferation, A Compendium*, prepared for the Committee on Government Operations, United States Senate, April 1975.

<sup>23</sup> Public Law 94-329, enacted June 30, 1976, Section 305, pp. 27-28. See also "Conference Report on International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act of 1976," Ninety-Fourth Congress, Second Session, House Report 94-1272, pg. 53-54.

<sup>24</sup> The endorsements from outside Congress were as follows:

David Lilienthal, First Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission; Jeremy Stone, Director, Federation of American Scientists; Common Cause; Committee for a SANE Nuclear Policy; Sierra Club; Friends Committee on National Legislation; Friends of the Earth; Environmental Policy Center; Ralph Nader's Congress Watch; National Taxpayers Union; The National Council of Churches; The Jesuit Office of Social Ministers; The Independent Phi Beta Kappa Environmental Study Group; Citizens Rights Committee; Women Strike for Peace; Council for a Livable World; United Auto Workers; Network.

<sup>25</sup> H.R. 15419, as reported, removed most obstacles to nuclear deals such as those between Germany and Brazil and between France and Pakistan; had no requirement that loopholes in existing nuclear agreements between the U.S. and other countries be closed; delayed any U.S. action to tighten nuclear export controls until all nations agreed to the stronger system, thus making any strengthened system a dead letter; and hobbled Congress' ability to scrutinize a presidential decision to overturn a Nuclear Regulatory Commission ruling against a nuclear export license by eliminating the requirements for 60-days notice and a detailed explanation of the President's decision. For further information, see Rep. George E. Brown, Jr., "Additional Views (Dissenting) on H.R. 15419, as amended," House Report 94-1613, pp. 55-60.

<sup>26</sup> Principal provisions of nonproliferation legislation would probably include: strengthened licensing criteria to be applied immediately by the U.S. to all its nuclear exports; provisions for international negotiations to establish strengthened nuclear export conditions by all nuclear suppliers, procedures to be followed in the event a nation violates its agreement with a nuclear supplier nation, and procedures to be followed in the event of diversion, theft or sabotage of nu-



clear materials; the closing of loopholes in U.S. bilateral nuclear agreements with other nations through renegotiation of those agreements; provisions for adequate participation by Congress in examining nuclear agreements for cooperation and amendments thereto, including a nonproliferation assessment statement on nuclear exports by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; and increased support to the safeguards efforts of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

<sup>27</sup> Richard J. Barber Associates, Inc., *LDC Nuclear Power Prospects, 1975-1990: Commercial, Economic and Security Implications*, report prepared for ERDA, pp. 11-8.

<sup>28</sup> See "India—The Strange Case of Wasted Billions," Separate Views of Hon. Clarence D. Long, Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriation Bill, 1975, House of Representatives, Ninety-Fourth Congress, First Session, House Report 94-53, pp. 51-58.

<sup>29</sup> "Light Capital Technology—The Only Hope for Foreign Aid," Additional views of the Hon. Clarence D. Long, Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriation Bill, 1976, House of Representatives, House Report 94-857, pp. 61-63.

<sup>30</sup> "Helping the Poor Help Themselves—New Directions in Economic Development," Additional Views of the Hon. Clarence D. Long, Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriation Bill, 1977, House Report 94-1228, pp. 62-65.

For more discussion of light capital technology, see *Appropriate Technology: Problems and Promises*, Nicolas Jequier, Development Center of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, 1976 and *Small is Beautiful*, E. F. Schumacher, (New York: Harper, Rowe, 1973).

<sup>31</sup> *Energy for Rural Development: Renewable Resources and Alternative Technologies for Developing Countries*, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C. 1976, pp. 155-160.

<sup>32</sup> For discussion of improving efficiency of energy use in both less developed and industrial nations, see Barry Commoner, "Energy," *The New Yorker*, February 2, 9, and 16, 1976; Arjun Makhijani, *Energy Policy for the Rural Third World*, International Institute for Environment and Development, September 1976; and Amory Lovins, "Scale, Centralization, and Electrification in Energy Systems," paper prepared for the Oak Ridge National Laboratory Symposium entitled *Future Strategies of Energy Development*, October 17, 1976.

<sup>33</sup> Barber Associates, pp. III 37-41 and figures III-3 and III-4.

<sup>34</sup> Some action in light capital energy development is occurring within the Energy Research and Development Administration (ERDA) and within AID. In November, 1976, ERDA initiated a Cooperative Research and Development Program With Developing Countries, with emphasis "on the development of small-scale, decentralized energy technologies." However, as of this writing, this program has received practically no funding. AID has at least two sources of statutory authority for programs in light capital energy technologies. Section 106 of the Foreign Assistance Act, enacted in December 1975, authorizes foreign aid for "programs to help developing countries alleviate their energy problems by increasing their production and conservation of energy, through . . . research and development of suitable energy sources and conservation methods, . . . and pilot projects to test new methods of production or conservation of energy."

Section 107 of the Foreign Assistance Act, enacted at the same time, provided up to \$20 million for "the development and dissemination of technologies appropriate for developing countries." An Appropriate Technology Fund has been created to carry out

this program. Further the House Committee Report on this legislation ("International Development and Food Assistance Act of 1975," House Report 94-442, pg. 52) makes clear that additional funds under the Food and Nutrition category (Section 103 of the Foreign Assistance Act under which the largest part of AID's budget is authorized) can be used for "activities in the energy field directly related to agricultural or rural development." Within AID, the African Bureau has contracted for a study to recommend actions on village energy sources in Africa.

<sup>35</sup> As a beginning in sensitizing international opinion, U.S. participation in the 1979 U.N. Conference on Science and Technology could emphasize light capital technologies in general and light capital energy technologies in particular.

<sup>36</sup> Some of the international organizations in which the U.S. can advocate light capital energy technologies are the International Energy Agency, the Council on International Economic Cooperation in Paris, the World Bank Group, the Inter-American Development Bank, the Asian Development Bank, the United Nations and its member organizations such as the U.N. Development Program, the World Food Council and other international food organizations such as the newly-capitalized International Fund for Agricultural Development, the Organization of American States, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the Development Assistance Committee (DAC), the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the consultative groups on aid to particular poor nations in which the U.S. participates.

The Long amendment to the Inter-American Development Bank Authorization Act required the U.S. to propose that "the development and utilization of light-capital or intermediate technologies should be accepted as major facets of the Bank's development strategy, . . ." (See Public Law 94-302). Language in the FY 1977 Foreign Aid Appropriations Bill Committee Report (House Report 94-1228, pg. 40) calls for action by the multilateral development banks in the field of light capital energy technologies.

<sup>37</sup> Division of Reactor Development and Demonstration, Office of the Assistant Administrator for Nuclear Energy, ERDA. This figure represents the cost for a nuclear reactor for which construction begins now and which begins operation in 1985.

<sup>38</sup> Barber Associates, pg. II-17 and figure II-12.

<sup>39</sup> Albert Wohlstetter, "Spreading the Bomb Without Quite Breaking the Rules," p. 172.

<sup>40</sup> Other nuclear exporting countries have financial institutions similar to the Export-Import Bank with at least as favorable interest rates and repayment terms for nuclear reactors. Subsidies, therefore, have been a common feature of all countries' nuclear exports. See Barber Associates, pg. IV-39.

<sup>41</sup> Wohlstetter, "Spreading the Bomb Without Quite Breaking the Rules," pg. 165.

<sup>42</sup> Department of State cable, "Federal Republic of Germany-Brazil Nuclear Cooperation Media Reaction," July 2, 1975 (unclassified cable).

<sup>43</sup> Under this policy, countries receiving Canadian nuclear technology would be limited to those who at least "accept international safeguards on their entire nuclear programme." Any nonnuclear weapon state exploding a nuclear device would immediately be cut off from any Canadian nuclear shipments. See statement by Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs, Donald Jamieson, December 22, 1976.

<sup>44</sup> Don Obendorfer, *Washington Post*, December 8, 1976, pg. 1.

<sup>45</sup> Warren H. Donnelly, "Enrichment Requirements of France and the Federal Republic Germany 1977-1985," September 14, 1976, Congressional Research Service.

<sup>46</sup> See the following press articles: Peter T. Kalborn, "A-Power Opposition Growing in

Europe," *New York Times*, September 26, 1976, pg. 16. *Nuclear Industry*, January, 1977, pg. 32. Bernard D. Nossiter, "British Body Sees Danger in Fast Breeder Reactors," *The Washington Post*, September 23, 1976, pg. A-21. "Proliferation Debate," *Washington Star*, September 29, 1976, editorial. Philip B. Smith and Ruud Spanhoff, "The Nuclear Energy Debate in the Netherlands," *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, February 1976, pp. 41-44.

<sup>47</sup> *Survey of Current Business*, Department of Commerce, December 1976, pg. S-3; also see "U.S. Nuclear Power Export Activities; Final Environmental Statement," ERDA-1542 April 1976, Vol. 1, pp. 4-16.

<sup>48</sup> Testimony by Arthur Laffer in *Nuclear Proliferation: Future U.S. Foreign Policy Implications*, pg. 112. See also Joseph M. Burns, "Alleged Market Failures in Financing U.S. Exports," pp. 364-389.

## THE 1977 LABOR DAY MESSAGE

### HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. PHILLIP BURTON. Mr. Speaker, the esteemed Lane Kirkland, secretary-treasurer of the AFL-CIO, has prepared a set of remarks to the American people on Labor Day. I deem them important enough for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

#### THE 1977 LABOR DAY MESSAGE

(By Lane Kirkland)

Since 1894 the first Monday in September has been set aside to honor the men and women who built America, who keep the wheels turning and maintain the flow of goods and services in the largest and most complex economy the world has ever seen.

On this Labor Day 1977 our country is entering its third century of the great struggle to create a just society—a society in which every citizen has a chance to achieve his or her highest potential, a chance to learn to the limit of his capacity, a chance to do productive and worth-while work and to share fairly in the rewards of work.

We take pride in what we and our forebears have contributed in the struggle for social and economic justice. From the beginning our unions have fought for better schools, better health care, better housing; for equal justice and equal opportunity.

We intend to keep fighting for all of these things, not merely for ourselves but for all men and women, at home and abroad.

One important part of that fight, one that should concern every American who wants to see his country move ahead toward justice and decency, is the fight to see that everyone who works for a living receives a living wage.

Very few union members have any personal stake in the federal minimum wage. Most have succeeded, through collective bargaining with their employers, in raising their earnings well above any conceivable legal minimum.

But we are appalled that there are 10 million Americans who work 40 hours a week, 52 weeks a year, often at hard and dirty jobs, and who are paid less than poverty wages. The hourly rate the government says is absolutely necessary today to raise a worker above the poverty level is \$2.81. The minimum wage the government says an employer may now pay a worker is \$2.30 an hour. That is a disgraceful commentary on America's national priorities.

It is disgraceful that more than one worker out of 10, no matter how hard he tries to pay his own way, still must turn to public assistance, to food stamps, to private chari-

ties, to keep his family together with a roof over their heads.

It is even more disgraceful that a great many workers are illegally paid even less than the minimum. The Labor Department recently reported that in the first half of fiscal 1977, unscrupulous employers swindled more than 300,000 minimum wage workers out of nearly \$58 million.

The Labor Department made a survey of the workers who were cheated last year. It found that two out of five of those workers were the primary earners of families. A fourth had two or more dependents. Half of them were women. One in five was black. Two-thirds were over 40 or under 20. Three-fourths were retail trade workers or service workers. Two-thirds lived in the South.

Those workers were the lucky ones, the ones whose employers were caught and compelled to pay up what they had stolen. A great many violations are never reported. There are, for instance, a million and a half household workers who are covered by the Minimum Wage Act and who are paid an average of \$2,732 a year and have no sick leave, vacation pay, pensions or holiday pay. This, again, is a disgrace to American society.

Early this year the AFL-CIO Executive Council urged the Congress to increase the minimum wage to \$3 an hour and to include an automatic mechanism in the Act to maintain the minimum wage at 60 percent of average hourly earnings in manufacturing. That recommendation was, and is, fair and reasonable. The minimum wage should not be a poverty wage. It should be a wage that meets the definition in the Act itself and allows a worker to maintain at least a "minimum standard of living necessary for health, efficiency and general well-being."

But because further delay is intolerable, the AFL-CIO is supporting a bill now before Congress that will raise the minimum to \$2.65 next January 1 and raise it to 53 percent of the average wage in manufacturing by January 1, 1980. It is not all that we wanted or sought. But it is a good bill that will go a long way toward providing economic justice for the lowest-paid workers in the country.

Modest and reasonable as it is, however, the bill is under heavy fire by employers who want to preserve the status quo and maintain a pool of cheap labor.

Back in 1938, when the first minimum wage was established by the Congress at 25 cents an hour, business spokesmen wrung their hands and cried that the economy would never survive, that inflation, unemployment and ruin were just around the corner. They have repeated those arguments every time since then that the Congress has acted to raise the minimum, and they are repeating them today.

There has never been a word of truth in those arguments, and there is no truth in them today. Studies by the Labor Department in both Democratic and Republican administrations have shown that minimum wage increases have never had more than a slight and temporary adverse effect. Every increase has been followed by higher employment and increased economic activity.

But the enemies of fair wages don't want to be confused by facts. They will be raising the same battle cry when the bill comes up in the House in mid-September and again later in the Senate.

In the fight to keep millions of their fellow citizens in poverty, they have these goals:

First, they will try to set a subminimum wage for teenagers on the pretense of trying to lower youth unemployment. In truth, this scheme has nothing to do with teen-age unemployment. It is simply a device to give fast-food operators and other employers a large labor source to exploit.

A youth subminimum would increase unemployment among older workers, starting with those 20 to 24 who are trying to estab-

lish families and going right through the minority mothers and fathers who would be thrown out of work so that the employer could hire their sons and daughters at a cheaper rate. Discrimination against the young in the form of wage cuts makes no more sense than wage cuts for blacks, women, Spanish-speaking citizens, Vietnam veterans or any other group with a high unemployment rate. The only solution to unemployment is more jobs, not discriminatory wage rates.

The second effort will be to eliminate indexing—the setting of the minimum wage at a percentage of the average wage in manufacturing. Without indexing minimum wage workers will never get above the poverty line. But with indexing at 53 percent they will do so, reducing their dependence on public assistance and making them independent, self-supporting citizens and taxpayers. Indexing must not be defeated.

Finally, there will be an effort to reduce the \$2.65 minimum. That figure, effective next January, would only restore half of the buying power lost since the last time the minimum wage was increased. Any reduction below this figure would deprive minimum wage workers of what they absolutely need to live decently and it would deprive the economy of the boost it would receive from a restoration of buying power for low-wage workers.

These are the goals of the people who have a vested interest in poverty, who see fatter profits in human exploitation and who like a society in which a large pool of cheap labor is fighting over jobs at starvation wages.

It is that kind of society America has been struggling to put behind her in the long fight for decency and justice.

But they are not decent goals for a country that has been struggling for 200 years to achieve human justice.

If America is ever to become the integrated society of creative, self-supporting citizens envisioned by its founders, Congress must not let the exploiters have their way in this matter. And it is the job of every citizen to see that Congress does its duty.

#### NATIONAL SICKLE CELL MONTH

#### HON. HAROLD E. FORD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join Congressman CARBONELL COLLINS in the cosponsorship of legislation which will declare September "National Sickle Cell Month." Sickle cell anemia, a genetic blood disease which affects 1 out of every 400 black Americans, has no cure at the present time. It is, furthermore, a disease which has not been subjected to aggressive and careful research and as a consequence, a number of misconceptions and negative attitudes exist about it.

During the August congressional recess, my awareness of the problem and attitudes associated with sickle cell anemia was pointedly enhanced when a constituent of the Eighth District, Tennessee, was rejected by the Air Force Academy Preparatory School—after being admitted—due to his having the sickle cell trait (SCT). According to Air Force Academy officials, anyone having the SCT is not eligible for admission. With this being the case 10 percent of all black Americans are automatically

disqualified for admission to the Air Force Academy.

Of course, it should be realized that merely having SCT is not the disease itself. Moreover, SCT is an area of particular ambivalence in the medical field. Dr. William Crosby, a veteran in hematology, stated a few years ago that "everything about SCT is not plain black and white, and SCT is a harmless genetic marker." He emphasized the fact that 1 in 10 black Americans carries SCT, therefore, a most common finding.

Because so little is known about sickle cell anemia in general, and because so much needs to be learned, I feel not only a responsibility but also an obligation to support any move which has as its purpose the promotion of the cure and a wider comprehension of every aspect of this disease.

Neither my district, nor your district, hence America, can afford to lose the leadership of promising young minds as a result of conjecture and theory which needs to be proven. Let us all rally behind the wisdom and foresight of the gentle lady from the seventh district of Illinois and support the declaration that September be named "National Sickle Cell Month."

#### CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF POSTAL SERVICE CHANGES

#### HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for congressional control over proposed changes in the levels and types of services provided to the American people by the Postal Service.

Under existing law, the Postal Service currently has the sole power to make such changes. Whenever the Postal Service wishes to make a change in the levels or types of services which would result in a reduction of such services on a nationwide or substantially nationwide basis, it must first seek an "advisory opinion" from the Postal Rate Commission. But, regardless of the Commission's advice, the Postal Service may unilaterally proceed to make the change. For instance, if the Postmaster General decided to eliminate Saturday mail delivery, he would simply notify the Postal Rate Commission of his plans. The Commission is required to hold a hearing, and as a practical matter, the Postal Service probably would not make the change effective until the hearing had been completed and the Commission had issued its opinion. But, regardless of the nature of the advisory opinion, the Postal Service may proceed to do as it wishes.

The legislation which I introduce today will change that. If the Postmaster General wishes to make a reduction in the levels or types of services, he will have to submit a proposal to the Congress; and if either House adopts a resolution of disapproval within 60 days, the change cannot become effective. This is similar



to the procedure followed when the President submits a reorganization plan to the Congress.

The Postal Reorganization Act did not define what is a "level or type" of postal service, or what is a change which has a "nationwide or substantially nationwide" impact. The legislation which I introduce today includes such a definition. More importantly, it will clarify what the Postal Service can and cannot do without the approval of the Congress.

I believe this legislation strikes a proper balance. It would preserve the independence of the Postal Service from day-to-day supervision by the Congress, but would require congressional approval of major policy changes which, of course, is the basic constitutional role of the Congress.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY AND DEPENDENCY

### HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, last July, I testified before the Social Security Subcommittee of Ways and Means to raise objection to a portion of the administration's social security bill, H.R. 8218. The portion of the bill to which I addressed my remarks is found in title III, "The Equal Rights Amendments of 1977."

The administration proposes to reinstitute the dependency test for husband's and widower's benefits struck down by the Supreme Court last March, and extended its applicability to wife's, widow's, mother's, and father's benefits. The Court found the test discriminatory, because it was imposed only on men seeking benefits from the wage records of their fully insured wives. The test was not imposed on similarly situated women.

Carolyn Shaw Bell, who holds the Katharine Corman Chair in Economics at Wellesley College, published an article in Newsweek which discusses why the notion of dependency no longer fits family and work patterns of contemporary society. I believe she creates a good argument against the administration dependency plan which further entrenches the notion in a system struggling with its applicability already. The article follows:

#### SOCIAL SECURITY AND DEPENDENCY

(By Carolyn Shaw Bell)

The Census defines a family as a group of two or more people related by blood, marriage or adoption who live together: families exist, obviously, because people want them to. For some reason, however, we think and talk about the family as if it existed all by itself, apart from its members. We describe the "family life cycle," and worry about the "death of the family." Business and government view policy decisions in terms of "the average family." President Carter has even promised a "family impact" statement to accompany new legislation.

Most of us accept without question the repeated use of that "typical" American family—the married man supporting a wife and two children—when we talk about so-

cial and economic policies. The Census Bureau has just revealed, however, that this familiar type has practically vanished. There are 56 million families in this country and only 3.3 million of them fit this pattern—a mere 6 percent of the total.

Why don't we stop having families as the focus of our concerns, and concentrate on individuals instead? If we stopped pretending there was such a thing as "the typical American family," we might be more sensitive to the actual problems posed by the many different ways we live—both in and out of families.

#### TAXES AND CHOICES

Start with income taxes. Most income in the country is earned at work and consists of wages and salaries. But families don't work and earn wages, family members do. "The worker" is an individual—the worker's income belongs to the earner. How those of us who earn wages choose to share our income is our business, not that of the tax authorities. If you want to spend your income supporting a wife and I want to spend mine supporting a child and somebody else wants to spend his supporting a hobby of collecting antique automobiles or a crusade for preserving the wilderness, let us respect each of our individual choices. Why involve "the family"?

Of course, if we Americans decide that having children is a good thing, and if we want to help parents support their children, then we can provide cash payments, or subsidies to parents. Such children's allowances exist in most European countries and in Canada to express society's interest in its future citizens.

Move on to national health insurance. If we want good medical care, we want it for individuals. Families don't get measles, or heart attacks, or die of cancer. If we want to pay for medical care by taxing payrolls, that doesn't mean medical benefits have to be provided via the people on payrolls—"the worker and the worker's family." Most workers are married to other workers so they'll both pay taxes to provide medical benefits.

#### THE COST OF LIVING

Why tie health care to "the worker's family" when people move in and out of families. Babies are born, children go off to college, young adults leave to form their own families or live alone. Death or separation breaks up a family unit and some adults become new dependents for their relations. Once we recognize that "the family" is a dynamic concept, and that families incessantly change, then we can agree that caring for individuals is what's essential.

Consider the high cost of living, and the battle (if there's to be one) against inflation. Our basic measure of living costs, the Consumer Price Index, doesn't pretend to measure every price change that affects us. Although a new, more representative index will shortly appear, the current figure includes only those commodities purchased by a fairly small group of families—urban wage earners and clerical workers.

Furthermore, the cost of living figures most frequently quoted refer to that same familiar group—John Doe supporting his wife Mary and their two kids Dick and Jane—that makes up such a tiny minority of all families. We need cost-of-living data for childless couples—who outnumber the "typical" family eight to one. We need to know how inflation hits the single mother supporting her children—there are twice as many of them as of the mythical average family.

Think about minimum wages. George Meany protests that \$2.50 an hour (proposed by the White House) is below the poverty level. But he's referring to the poverty-level income for a family, not for an individual worker.

When minimum wages were first enacted during the Depression of the '30's, the "typical" American family was a lot more prevalent. Most children lived in homes where the father was the breadwinner and most women were supported by their husbands. One man's wages probably did represent one family's income, and the link between minimum earnings and poverty did make sense.

Today the one-earner family is in the minority. Fourteen million husbands support their wives, with or without children. One and a half million wives are the sole earners for their husbands and families, and there are 5 million other women without husbands, whose earnings provide family income. But all told that's less than one out of three families. Most wage earners live in families with other wage earners. And families come in all sizes—it's impossible to calculate a minimum wage for one person that would keep all kinds of families above the poverty level.

Of course, we may wish to provide additional income for poor families. But let's keep wages a matter of the individual worker and the individual job.

#### ISSUES AND INDIVIDUALS

You can try thinking about other social issues in terms of individuals. It would help the city welfare administrator struggling with three definitions of the family to determine eligibility for housing, for medical care, and for public assistance. It would help the elderly widow and widower who won't marry because they'll lose social security benefits.

I think we should start thinking about individuals because we exist. More of us are being separate persons rather than family members these days. Between 1970 and 1975 the number of people living by themselves increased by about 40 per cent. We live individually as young adults escaping from our parents, as older adults choosing not to marry, as people of any age whose marriages have dissolved through death or separation.

Thinking about individuals doesn't mean that families don't count, or that the family way of life is obsolete. It does mean that we live and grow as human beings, we move in and out of different families as family members, but each of us is a person from birth to death.

JULY 29, 1977.

HON. DONALD M. FRASER,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRASER: I applaud your testimony, before the House Social Security Subcommittee, in its characterization of the concept of dependency as "outmoded." As you know, I have long favored earnings-splitting since my early testimony before the JEC.

At this point I think it would help, in trying to get people to realize that dependency does not mean much anymore, to emphasize that the majority of working families contain two adult working partners. The BLS figures that are quoted say that over half the husband-wife families in the country have both spouses working. In reality the percentage is much higher if you exclude some 5 million families where neither partner is working: both partners are retired, or still finishing their education. Rather than argue the economic role of women, I would urge you to reiterate that the single earner family is obsolete and that dependency is not a useful concept if it cannot easily, and objectively, be determined.

I enclose a copy of my article in the May Newsweek. I would be very happy to discuss these issues further with you if it would help.

Sincerely yours,

CAROLYN SHAW BELL,  
Katharine Corman Professor of Economics.

**ENVIRONMENTAL HAZARDS OF  
COAL PRODUCTION—ASSESS-  
MENT BY THE EASTERN PENN-  
SYLVANIA GROUP SIERRA CLUB**

**HON. ROBERT W. EDGAR**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker I am pleased to share with my colleagues an excellent briefing on the environmental impact of increased coal production. This briefing prepared by Albert J. Slap and Dena Sukol Wright, both of the Eastern Pennsylvania Group of the Sierra Club, describes the problems which occur to our land, water, and air as a result of underground and surface mining. The House, in approving H.R. 8444, endorsed the President's goal of increasing domestic coal production to over 1 billion tons. I agree with the President that we should rely more heavily upon our abundant resources of coal to meet our energy needs while maintaining the quality of our land, water, and air. I am indebted to Mr. Slap and Ms. Wright for helping me understand the complexities of coal-related environmental problems, and I believe that their August 3, 1977, briefing deserves the attention of our colleagues:

AUGUST 3, 1977.

Congressman ROBERT W. EDGAR,  
Cannon House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN EDGAR: You have requested that we submit to you an analysis of that part of the National Energy Act (H.R. 8444) which addresses coal conversion. A combination of time constraints and complexity of issues involved has necessitated an overview of the problems and possibilities that we see, rather than a comprehensive report.

The bill establishes in Section 3(5) a national energy goal which would increase annual coal production at least 400 million tons above 1976 production levels of 671.2 million tons (figure provided by the National Coal Association, Washington, D.C.), by 1985. Our major concern is how this 60% increase in coal production and resultant consumption impacts upon the environment. As you are aware, EPA Administrator Douglas Costle has testified before Congress that increased sulfur dioxide emissions, as a result of coal conversion, would largely be offset by utility reductions if proposed conservation and clear air controls are adopted. We do not have before us the data Mr. Costle used in making this determination; however, from the research we have done, we are skeptical that this offset will actually occur. The environmental issues raised by coal conversion include not only increased sulfur dioxide pollution, but the environmental problems inherent in mining itself. We, therefore, would like to provide you with a brief overview of the environmental impacts of increased mining and coal combustion.

**MINING**

There are two principal mining methods—the underground and surface. These two types are further broken down into sub-categories relating to more specific methods used, dependent on applicability of land area/coal quantity to mining method. (Contour surface mining and area surface mining, for example.) In all types of mining, land preparation includes clearing vegetation from the construction site. In this respect, any choice of mining method poses serious reclama-

mation problems because after the land is disturbed recontouring and revegetation are difficult. Although the aerial disturbances of surface mining are generally more visible than underground, both methods disturb the surface, produce wastes that require disposal, can affect water resources, and expose materials that produce acids when dissolved in water.

In surface mining, the major reclamation problem is dealing with surface disruption. This includes restoring surface topography, replacing topsoil, fertilizing and revegetating. In contrast, the reclamation problems associated with underground mining relate more to the disposal of materials mined with the coal. While these materials are often removed at the surface through a cleaning process, they cannot be piled up and left uncovered because they produce acid water runoff when dissolved by rain, landslides, and other dangerous conditions. Another problem associated with reclamation after underground mining is subsidence. In some situations, the surface will subside, limiting subsequent surface usage. These, then, are the two general problems associated with reclamation of mined land.

**SURFACE MINING—ENVIRONMENTAL  
CONSIDERATIONS**

**Water:** The principal water pollutant in surface mining is suspended solids. These solids are a product of runoff from solid waste piles. Under controlled conditions, drainage and runoff water is collected, allowed to settle and treated. Suspended solids are thereby reduced to a 30 ppm concentration and a zero acid content.

**Air:** Air pollutants are generated from two sources: diesel-fueled support equipment and wind erosion. Using electrical equipment does not eliminate air pollutants, but merely transfers them from the mining site to the electric power station site. While reclamation reduces particulates resulting from erosion, it increases other pollutants by requiring more diesel-powered trucks, tractors, etc.

**Solids:** Solid wastes vary as a function of surface mining technique. An area strip mine excavating 10,000 tons of coal per day would produce 100 tons of overburden per day, an amount approximately equal quantitatively to the daily municipal refuse from a town of 40,000 people. The same coal production from a contour mine would result in 120,000 tons of overburden per day—approximately equal, again quantitatively, to the quantity of municipal refuse of 48 million people. (Statistics from Energy Alternatives: A Comparative Analysis. Prepared for Council on Environmental Quality by The Science and Public Policy Program, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma.)

**Land Use:** In general, area surface mining, which is used in flat terrains is more land-economical than contour surface mining, which is used in hilly or mountainous terrains. Area surface (strip) mining requires 5.9 acres per 10<sup>12</sup> Btu's in Northern Appalachia as compared to 12.0 acres per 10<sup>12</sup> Btu's required in contour mining. Moreover, surface mining in general, is less land economical in Northern Appalachia than for example in the Northwestern section of the country. This is due to the differences in seam thickness of the coal. A Northwest mine producing 10,000 tons of lower Btu coal per day would strip 2.5 square miles in 30 years; a comparable mine in Northern Appalachia would strip 27 square miles in 30 years. However, in the Northwest section, other environmental problems, i.e. nondegradation of clean air regions, result.

**UNDERGROUND MINING—ENVIRONMENTAL  
CONSIDERATIONS**

**Water:** The principal water pollutant in Appalachia (where most underground mining is done) is acid drainage. The other dissolved solids are sulfates and minerals which con-

tribute to hardness. Lime treatment is effective in reducing acidity to zero and the resultant effluent then meets EPA guidelines.

**Air:** Because electrically powered equipment is generally used underground, air emissions are not a problem. (Dust within the mine, however, poses an occupational hazard.)

**Solids:** Solids produced when mine water is treated amount to 56,000 tons per year for a typical mine in Northern Appalachia.

**Land:** Subsidence and refuse storage sites, as well as a water treatment facility site are the major impacts on land use.

An additional problem with underground mining, not developed here, is occupational-related hazards (black lung).

In summary, the environmental problems associated with coal mining are diverse. We are concerned that the House Bill, while making reference to environmental safeguards, may not adequately address the specific environmental problems posed. Specifically, strict regulation of solids disposal from underground mining and strip mining legislation which addresses land reclamation in surface mining is essential. We are aware that H.R. 2—a Surface Mining Bill—has just today been signed by President Carter. Unfortunately, we have not been able to research this bill thoroughly; however, we are aware that the final bill as approved by the joint conference allows both strip mining in national forests in the west and on western "alluvial valley floors", subject to certain provisions. Unless this permissive approach is counterbalanced by sufficiently strong regulations by the EPA, we foresee serious environmental consequences.

**COMBUSTION**

The major environmental problem associated with coal combustion, as EPA Administrator Costle has noted, is an increased level of sulfur oxides emitted into the air. However, this does not fully address the environmental impacts of the combustion process. Additional problems are caused by increased levels of carbon dioxide and respirable particulates. Further, while under the best of circumstances, air quality in a coal-burning area would meet the ambient standards established by the EPA, other hazardous pollutants may be involved. We are concerned that without adequate, ongoing research, new environmental problems, generated by coal combustion will be overlooked. Within the past week, we have become aware of two such studies which are rather alarming. This first appeared in *The New York Times*, July 25, 1977, in which the National Academy of Sciences after a 2½ year study, warns that heavy use of coal in which additional CO<sub>2</sub> is emitted into the air, may bring an adverse shift in the climate (the greenhouse effect). The study indicates that this increase in temperature could "radically disrupt food production, lead to a 20 foot rise in sea level and seriously lower productivity of the oceans."

The second study was done by Brookhaven National Laboratory in New York at the request of the Energy Research and Development Administration. The Brookhaven Study warns that increased coal use could raise the sulfur-caused annual death toll to 35,000 by the year 2010. This report does not square with Administrator Costle's evaluation of increased sulfur dioxide emitted into the atmosphere. We strongly advise legislation which makes flue gas desulfurization devices (Scrubbers) mandatory. "Scrubbers" remove the sulfur from stack gasses after combustion but before emission into the atmosphere. Another technical possibility in this area is the conversion of raw coal into a gas or liquid fuel, thereby reducing sulfur dioxides during combustion. The processes



which accomplish this end are not fully developed. Moreover, while they reduce pollutants at a point before combustion, they (the processes themselves) cause their own pollutants.

Another major concern that we have is related to deterioration of those areas designated as Class I areas. Currently, these areas are in the best "environmental condition." Allowing large facilities (e.g. new electric utility plants) to move into these areas may not raise the ambient levels above EPA guidelines; nevertheless, there would be an overall worsening of air quality in these regions. We strongly oppose legislation which would allow encroachment on these areas by new facilities. The Clean Air Act, as it now stands and as interpreted by the courts, provides safeguards against this problem. However, current proposals to amend the Clean Air Act pose serious threats to these safeguards. The House has adopted the Breaux Amendment which guts most of the significant deterioration provisions which protect clean air regions of the country. The Senate, by contrast, rejected the equivalent of the Breaux Amendment. If the Breaux Amendment is finally adopted, protection in the Clean Air Act for air quality over national parks and wilderness areas would be ineffectual. Thus, we would oppose the present coal conversion legislation without the nondegradation safeguard.

#### SUMMARY

Significant problems are raised by the massive conversion to coal use. The trade-offs between energy independence and environmental quality require complex problem-solving with no easy solutions. Because of time constraints, we have been limited in our ability to provide you with an in-depth study of the problems. However, we have focused on four major areas of concern: strip mining reclamation, increased controls on sulfur dioxide emissions, increased controls on solid wastes disposal, and deterioration of clean air regions in the country. Additionally, we are concerned with potential problems generated by increased coal consumption which are not yet known. We recognize that H.R. 8444 has made provisions for studies to be carried out which address environmental problems associated with increased coal consumption, by providing a budget of \$2 million for such purposes. The adequacy of this amount should be monitored carefully to assure that it does not seriously undermine vital information-gathering processes necessary for public health and welfare decision-making.

Coal is an abundant resource with a developed technology for its recovery. It offers much in the way of energy-independence for this country. But, it is not a cheap resource. In order to make its utilization environmentally acceptable, strong safeguard technologies must be developed and implemented. These processes cost money and must be calculated as part of the cost of the resource itself.

We hope that this cursory overview provides you with useful input. We strongly support your past record in environmental legislation. Please let us know if you wish additional materials from us for possible future legislation which addresses environmental problems associated with our national policy of increased coal consumption.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT J. SLAP, Esq.,  
Chairman, Eastern Pennsylvania Group.  
DENA SUKOL WRIGHT,  
Research Assistant.

### "NEW ICE CREAM STANDARDS UNJUSTIFIED"

HON. FREDERICK W. RICHMOND

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, on August 2, the Agriculture Subcommittee on Domestic Marketing, Consumer Relations and Nutrition, which I chair, and Mr. Rose's Subcommittee on Dairy and Poultry, conducted a joint hearing to investigate a Food and Drug Administration proposal to change the standard of identity for ice cream. Following comprehensive studies of the testimony received during and after the hearing, I have found no justification for the change in ice cream standards.

The proposed regulations were formulated several years ago as a simple requirement for ingredient labeling. During the past 2 years though, they have been changed. The FDA has been convinced by the ice cream industry that milk-derived, rather than whole milk ingredients would be adequate to meet half the milk requirement for ice cream. Today's ice cream contains only 20 percent milk. The new standards would require that ice cream contain only 10 percent whole milk; the other 10 percent could include dairy-derived ingredients such as whey and caseinates. These are not whole milk products. They are milk by-products.

Depending on the combinations used—and there will be many—each carton of ice cream will have different ingredient labeling. By substituting whole milk with milk by-products, there is no guarantee present nutritional standards will be maintained. We can be sure ice cream manufacturers will use the cheapest ingredients possible by disguising them with more artificial flavorings.

This issue is not one to be taken lightly. More than 800 million gallons of ice cream are manufactured each year. Ice cream is used in Federal feeding programs as a nutritious source of calcium, vitamin B<sub>12</sub> and riboflavin. The new regulations would completely ignore these nutrients.

Instead, the FDA has decided that the nutritional quality of ice cream should be based entirely on protein. Ice cream has never been considered a significant source of protein, nor is the average American's intake of protein a problem.

Additionally, the ice cream industry stands to reap profits of more than \$70 million a year, and there is no guarantee these profits would be passed on to customers. In the meantime, additional stocks of nonfat dry milk, displaced by imported caseinates and cheap, domestic whey, would cost the consumer dearly. Additional Federal tax dollars would be committed to the Government dairy loan program. Taxpayers would pick up the tab, which could be more than \$200 million annually.

Mr. Speaker, consumers are not about to sit still while the agency mandated to protect our food tampers with one of

their favorites. FDA Commissioner Donald Kennedy is expected to announce his decision on the new regulations soon. I hope he will listen to the voice of the people. Following are excerpts of letters I have received from angry ice cream lovers:

"... Sometimes I almost believe that the people in Government are against the American people. It's things like this that disgust me..."—Rochester, N.Y.

"... Please don't let the FDA add caseinates or other fakes to ice cream. We have enough junk put in our food now..."—Scotia, N.Y.

"... One thing is for sure: Nobody but a chemist will be able to figure out what the ingredients in phony ice cream are because they have chemical names..."—Oklahoma City, Okla.

"... I feel very strongly that the Food and Drug Administration should work to protect the consumer against ersatz-makers instead of cooperating with them..."—Astoria, N.Y.

"... I think the FDA has dabbled in so many useless and unnecessary things and has ignored the real problems of 'junk food' (perhaps from fear of the big food companies). I wish someone would straighten them out. I don't like to see the taxpayers' money wasted on things such as this..."—Washington, D.C.

"... The American people have been so conditioned to poor products that many cannot tell good ones from poor ones..."—Edwardsville, Ill.

"... It is difficult to understand why the Food and Drug Administration should concern itself with this issue whose only purpose would be to serve the ice cream manufacturers when there are so many other pressing nutrition problems in this country. This misunderstanding of priorities, or perhaps it is a lack of priorities, characterizes many of the nutrition programs of Federal agencies..."—Washington, D.C.

"... The credibility of the FDA has suffered greatly in recent years. This matter doesn't help them..."—Tucson, Ariz.

"... If any food in America needs to be kept upgraded and full of pure, healthful contents, it is ice cream—a food that is fed to babies, invalids, and old people and every other American under the sun..."—Seattle, Wash.

### A TRIBUTE TO CHIEF HARRY "CHIP" CORNWELL

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Chief Harry "Chip" Cornwell of company No. 1 of the Mineola, N.Y., Fire Department. Mr. Cornwell will be honored on September 9, 1977 at a dinner given by his colleagues for 50 years of distinguished and loyal service to the department.

Chief Cornwell began his career of dedicated assistance to the department and the community in September of 1927 when his application to join company No. 1 was approved. His abilities and ambition were soon recognized, however, and in 1931 he was promoted to the presidency of company No. 1. From that

point on he continually rose in the ranks of public service, from second lieutenant, first lieutenant, captain, warden, executive secretary, deputy chief, and ultimately to chief of the department in 1955.

In addition to his many duties as chief, Mr. Cornwell has been involved in the supportive affairs and operations of both the company and the department. He has been a true leader in both the community and the department. There is no doubt in my mind that he will continue to be so.

Chief Cornwell's career had been highlighted by his dedicated and responsible performance. I extend my heartiest congratulations to an outstanding public servant on this his golden anniversary.

#### GOVERNMENT TOO BIG TO HANDLE

#### HON. JAMES ABDNOR

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, while other dates have gone down in history as memorable, Dave McNeill, executive vice president of the Greater South Dakota Association, believes a 1977 day in August is memorable. In his weekly news column, Mr. McNeill made the following observations which merit the consideration of my colleagues:

MONDAY, AUGUST 22, 1977—A DAY TO REMEMBER

PIERRE—The economic news report of the morning of August 22, 1977, provided the most astounding report ever heard by American taxpayers. The Federal government has fallen 7 billion dollars behind in spending this year. The commentator went on to tell of the negative impact on the U.S. economy this "short fall" would cause. It may sound unbelievable, but we are now being told that the taxpayer can't win at the Federal level. Overspend the Federal budget . . . taxes go up. Underspend the Federal budget . . . the economy sags from unemployment and other waves created by government spending.

It's all over at the Federal level. The citizens have lost control; our Federal bureaucracy is too big to handle. The way things are going we would need a billion-dollar study commission to understand why we can't afford to live if the Federal budget isn't spent to the penny. With the Federal budget in the neighborhood of 400 billion dollars per year (granted 6 or 7 billion one way or the other would be considered good estimating), they tell us now that because of the Federal spending impact, we must hit the spending level with pinpoint accuracy.

The kicker is we must get pinpoint accuracy from the Feds who just last week lost enough plutonium to blow up half the world. Pinpoint accuracy from the Feds who not long ago were ripped off to the tune of \$800,000 by a Transportation Department employee who simply told the computer to write him some checks. Pinpoint accuracy from the Feds whose computers are capable of sending checks to Social Security recipients with 5 or 6 too many zeros.

Looks like our fate is lost at the Federal level. Thankfully, at the state level we still have a chance to see spending cuts produce tax savings.

#### HERE IS WHAT THE GENERAL SAID

#### HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, Lt. Gen. Donn A. Starry recently got into trouble with the Carter administration for giving a speech to a high school graduation in which he speculated that the U.S.S.R. and Red China might get into a war and that the United States might be forced to choose sides. For this, ostensibly, the General was recalled from his position post in Germany as Commander of the V Corps, U.S. Army, Europe, and shifted to the position of Commanding General, U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command at Fort Monroe, Va., a lesser post. Actually, I question whether his speculation about a Sino-Soviet war was the real reason he was censured in this manner. If you read his entire speech, it was a speech concerning basic truths, values and a plea for realism and realistic thinking in this day of sloganeering and "pie in the sky" solutions to the world's problems.

By way of background, the General is not a lightweight. He has a total of 29 years commissioned service, has a master's degree in international relations, and is a decorated combat veteran holding the Silver Star, Bronze Star, and the Purple Heart. Therefore, I believe the General's speech has to be read in its entirety in order to have any perspective on his remarks on a possible war in the Far East. I commend his speech to the attention of my colleagues as it appeared in the Review of the News for July 6, 1977.

#### HERE IS WHAT THE GENERAL SAID

I thought perhaps we could spend these few minutes considering several things that seem to me to trouble your generation. You might not put them in the order that I do; you might not label them the way I do; but I think you'll recognize them for what they are—I'd call them peace, truth, God, and you.

Peace because a lot is being said about it. A lot of things are being done in its name, but it is and will remain an elusive vision through your lifetime, and so perspective about peace is important to you.

Truth because no one seems to be telling it much any more. There is loss of confidence in the truthfulness of our government, in the integrity of elected officials, which is having an effect on our society; it will continue to do so through your lifetime. So a perspective on the truth is important to you.

God, because although the "Liberals" tried to bury God several years ago, the basic values of our society are still those of our Christian heritage. You will live with the problem of decline of these values through your lifetime, and so perspective on God is important to you.

And you because this is your day. A day to pause a moment to consider who you are, where you are heading, and what you might carry along with you.

So here we go.

#### MEN CRY "PEACE"

Peace is an illusion. The absence of peace

in the world is, always has been, and always will be a fact of life. Conflict of some kind is a natural state of man—not so much war, as competition, competitiveness—in economics, in foreign affairs, in the quest by governments for goals for the governed. Conflict reflects the imperfectness of man in his world, and the perfectness of God in his universe. There will probably be war in your lifetime. The Soviets will continue to encourage and help their Arab friends try to eliminate the state of Israel. Our country may not be willing to go to war over this, but to turn our backs on Israel would be very difficult, and to allow Soviet control of the oil resources of the Middle East would be almost impossible.

The more critical the situation becomes the more likely we are to respond with violence. In your lifetime the Soviets will fight the Chinese, possibly simply continuing their ten-year-old border conflict, but more probably in a major war. Difficult as it may be to see the United States becoming involved in such a war, it is likely we would do so once it became apparent that one or the other of the antagonists was about to win and gain absolute control over the bulk of the Eurasian land mass. On the other side of the conflict spectrum, intra-national war—that is, war within the borders of a country—will be more likely, as both the Soviets and the Chinese continue to export their brand of revolution. The question of how to intervene in such situations without violating the national sovereignty of smaller states, when and how to meddle in what is essentially someone else's business, is not one easy to answer. More nations will have nuclear weapons—just as India has recently. This just increases the chances that a deliberate or irresponsible act by some small nation could trigger a war between larger nations. Could a nuclear attack on Los Angeles arranged by the Communist government of Ethiopia be distinguished from a Soviet attack in time to prevent the United States from launching a retaliatory attack on the Soviet Union? No one knows.

And so true peace will not come in your time. The only peace you can expect, and the only peace of any value to you, is peace of mind; peace that comes with understanding the imperfections of mankind and of having figured out how to cope with this imperfectness. It is a peace that puts you as much at ease as you can expect to be with your fellowman and the imperfections of the world you live in. Ultimately the price of that peace of mind is a willingness to sacrifice something for it; for it is still true that nothing worth having can be had for nothing.

#### TRUTH HAS A PRICE

Truth is a fragile commodity. The true state of things is frequently unpleasant. That's why we don't tell the truth more often—to ourselves or to others. It is more convenient not to. Instead we rationalize our own imperfections and those of the world around us. If we work hard enough at those rationalizations, we soon believe them ourselves, and when we do, our grasp of the truth is a little less sure than before. Like peace, truth is perfection; its distortion in our world is a measure of the imperfections of that world, and of the perfectness of God. For us there is no absolute truth; there are versions of what is, bound up in the bias of those who observe and report. In your lifetime the truth will be harder to learn than ever before. The "Liberal" press has adopted the adversary doctrine. They are not interested in the truth, only in the five percent or so of the news that deviates from the norm, which in an imperfect world is the only truth there is.

Presumably they would be willing to muck-rake around over every public administra-



tion just to see it fall, without concern for the consequences to the country, or to the quality of public administration. By someone's standards we are all less than perfect. If one wants to make an issue of imperfections, some reason can be made to attack every man who has held or could hold public office. The ensuing turmoil simply feeds into the hands of those who claim our form of government is not viable anyway, and has no right or hope for survival. Being objective is important, being skeptical is necessary, seeking after all the facts you can get is essential, in order to make reasonable judgments about what's going on around you, and what you should do about it. The price of truth is a willingness to ask difficult questions, knowing all the while that if the truth really comes in response, the answers will be equally difficult.

#### THE LIVING GOD

Several years ago the "Liberals" buried God. He wasn't important to them. They found their God in a liturgy which denies that anything—peace, truth, God, even life—is worthy of reverence. And because the Christian ethic is the very basis for our culture, western civilization has been stricken with the cancer of declining morality. Just over a month ago I stood in the Garden of Gethsemane, then walked the long trail across the Valley of the Dead to Golgotha, over the land where seething masses of people have struggled so many thousand years. It struck me that in the time of Christ they had a problem not at all unlike ours. They found peace and destroyed it with war; they found truth and denied it with lies; they found God and hung Him on a cross. The denial of God will continue in your lifetime; you will be called on to decide about Him, who He is, who you are in relation to Him. Perhaps it's not all that important; many people live their whole lives without solving this problem, but I suggest that your life takes on meaning, that the greatest value of a life is to spend it for something that lives after it, that in the end you become what you are through some cause you have made your own. And if you follow that line of reasoning, deciding about the part God plays in your world is important.

#### WISDOM AND YOU

And now what about you? This is your life. We reviewed some unpleasant realities simply to challenge you to think realistically about some hard questions that face you. Thinking seriously about what I've said could make you want to drop out of society. You can't drop out of society and remain a part of it. Three hundred years ago the Bounty mutineers did that and the society they created to replace the one they left came to be filled with all the disillusionments from which they had fled in the first place.

You are young and full of dreams. Your elders say that you'll get older pretty soon, more mature, and then you'll be all right. Well, that's not quite right. Youth is important. It's important that you stay young. Youth is not a time of life, it is a state of mind. Nobody grows old by living years. People grow old by deserting their dreams. Youth is a quality of the imagination, a vigor of emotions, a predominance of courage over timidity, and appetite for adventure opposed to the love of ease. Whatever your years, keep in your heart the dreams, the urge to challenge events, the unfailing child-like appetite for what's next, and the knowledge that the joy of life is in the living; that when you fall to live it to its fullest you miss all the joy of it. You are as young as your faith, as old as your despair. So long

as your heart holds dreams of hope, beauty, courage, so long are you young.

#### TO SERVE AN IDEAL

And so tonight you pass this turn in the road of your life, full of hope, full of dreams, full of anticipation for what comes next. I hope you will strive for and achieve great things. But remember, in many ways it's a far higher ideal to live an ordinary life in an extraordinary way, to serve an ideal amid the drab, humdrum surroundings of everyday life, and still retain a vision of the common man as a shadow of God.

And so your world goes out on every side, no wider than your heart is wide, and up above the world your sky no higher than your soul is high.

May the road ahead rise with you to new heights, may the wind be ever at your back, and may God carry you always in the palm of His hand.

#### BLUE SUEDE SHOES

### HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. President, the following comment appeared in the August 29, 1977, issue of the New Yorker:

We have a letter from a man who was thirteen years old in 1956:

I would like to tell you about one song recorded by Elvis Presley. It is a song he recorded in 1954 for the Sun label in Memphis, and it is called "That's All Right." I heard it two years later. The first words of the song are:

Well, that's all right, Mama,  
That's all right for you.  
That's all right, Mama,  
Just any way you do.

Elvis Presley's voice is like a high, sharp shiver. There isn't any part of the song not covered by a thrilling energy. This is a significant American song, sung by a significant man. I still have my copy of "That's All Right," on a long-playing album called "For LP Fans Only." That is a stupid name for an album—"For LP Fans Only." Whoever gave that title to that album understood the nature of Elvis Presley's simple energy but was afraid of it. The album is under the RCA label, but it has a number of songs, like "That's All Right" and "Mystery Train," that he recorded for Sun.

Elvis Presley was a cool guy. He was the coolest guy I have ever seen. He had a gift—a gift as great as, say, the gift of Marilyn Monroe for romantic comedy—and he had an instinctive generosity, too. He didn't know what he was about, but he was protected for a while by his naiveté and by his simple energy. He cut through gruesome layers of self-consciousness, although they closed in on him later. But they didn't close in on him completely, you know. Whatever there was toward the end of his life which was grotesque was probably the result of an attempt to keep his integrity and his cool—as he, imperfectly, understood the nature of his integrity and his cool. And he was cool up to the end. His single "Way Down" was on the charts the week he died.

I haven't seen anything on television or in the papers that gets to the point about how cool he was. Just drugs and money, and bad movies and Las Vegas and bodyguards and "hip-shaking" and getting fat. I saw a television newscast about Elvis and it made me

mad, because the newsman who conducted it was exactly the kind of nineteen-fifties guy—full of false inflection and false authority—who was completely blown away by Elvis; and there he was again, full of false inflection and false authority still, condescending to him. The newsman cut away to a little group of post-adolescent "experts," and they were worse. The new false post-adolescent authority that needs to be blown away by somebody. The only decent tribute I saw to Elvis was in the hallway of a building at the corner of Sullivan and Prince Streets. Somebody had put an old pair of blue shoes on a chest of drawers in the hallway with a handwritten sign. "Don't Step on My Blue Suede Shoes—In Memory of Elvis," the sign said.

#### FUNDING FOR ADVISORY NEIGHBORHOOD COMMISSIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SHOULD BE CONTINUED

### HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Congress should not delete funding for advisory neighborhood commissions—(ANC's)—in the fiscal year 1978 District of Columbia appropriation bill.

ANC's were authorized by Congress in the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to bring the views of the local neighborhood to the attention of the locally elected officials and city agencies. District residents voted 3 to 1 for ANC's as a special item on the ballot of the home rule charter referendum.

A typical ANC is in Southwest Washington where I live, as do several other Members of Congress. The nine ANC members were elected at the polls in Southwest last year and serve without compensation, in a neighborhood of about 20,000 people. The Southwest ANC's annual budget of \$21,000 pays for a part time employee, an office in the neighborhood, telephone, newsletter, and notices of meetings.

#### ACTIVITIES OF ANCS

The August-September issue of the Southwest, the Southwest community newsletter, tells of Southwest ANC activities on these neighborhood problems:

New zoning in Southwest, proposed by the city planning office to include higher density commercial and hi-rise apartments.

The city's urban renewal proposal for a new building by the railroad tracks in Southwest.

The Southwest neighborhood health clinic staffing by the city Department of Human Resources (DHR).

Maintenance, security and fire problems at public housing hi-rises in Southwest were brought to the attention of city officials.

Residential parking permits for Southwest.

The ANC in Southwest is clearly filling a needed function in a large city like Washington, D.C.—the 11th largest city in the country, ANC's throughout the city are valuable links between citizens in the neighborhoods and 40,000 officials

and employees of the many city departments, offices, boards, and bureaus.

Funding should be continued for ANC's in the District of Columbia budget.

#### A UNILATERAL CURB ON SPACE WEAPONS?

**HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS**

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, I have learned that Paul Warnke and Adam Yarmolinsky, chief Disarmament Agency officials, are recommending to President Carter that the United States unilaterally refrain from developing space weapons essential to protecting our intelligence and communications systems.

Warnke and Yarmolinsky are suggesting to the President that if the United States announces a policy of not developing devices such as killer satellites, then the Soviet Union will follow suit.

This faulty logic ignores, however, the fact that the Soviets have been developing hunter-killer satellites and other space weapons for several years now. Furthermore, the Warnke-Yarmolinsky thesis of unilateral restraint in countering Soviet weapons buildup has been consistently contradicted by Soviet actions for some 30 years now. Should Warnke and Yarmolinsky prevail the United States would be placed in such serious disadvantage that it would be next to impossible to redress.

Warnke and Yarmolinsky have vigorously opposed every new U.S. strategic weapons program. They have been ardent advocates of what amounts to unilateral disarmament, and they profess that the arms race is all our fault. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that the Congress and the American people keep an eagle eye on the SALT negotiations and the policy advocates at the Disarmament Agency.

The following Evans and Novak column from the August 27, 1977, Washington Post should be noted and deserves our concern:

#### A CURB ON SPACE WEAPONS?

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

A proposal to slow development of space weapons essential for protecting U.S. intelligence and communications in an all-out war is expected to go before President Carter soon in presidential review memorandum (PRM) 23.

Although finishing touches have not yet been put on PRM 23, the thrust of the inter-agency study is certain at this writing. It will seek to lead the President away from the Ford administration's push for swift development of outer-space weaponry.

The importance of developing top-secret technology to defend against possible Soviet attacks on U.S. satellites would seem obvious on its face. A Soviet attack destroying communication and spy satellites would leave the U.S. helpless. Nevertheless, the arms-control lobby, now riding high with Paul Warnke as director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA), looks

to outer space for an early test of the Warnke thesis on arms control.

Warnke's thesis: The United States should unilaterally abandon new weapons systems as an example to the Russians, assuming the Kremlin would then follow that example. This thesis, unsupported as yet by any evidence during the past 30 years of U.S.-Soviet relations, would be applied at once to outer-space warfare—if the President accepts the thrust of PRM 23.

In its dying days, the Ford administration conducted two secret studies into how the United States should respond to alarming Soviet advances in the technology of offensive outer-space warfare—satellite-killing Soviet satellites, sometimes called satellite interceptors. The Ford answer: full speed ahead for the United States.

A footnote: Compounding the U.S. danger was the conviction last spring of two Americans on espionage charges in TRW's top-secret weapons plant in California. They were charged with passing to Moscow this nation's most advanced outer-space warfare technology, immediately making U.S. satellites more vulnerable to potential Soviet attack.

#### JAYNE SCHIFF: SPIRIT AND DETERMINATION

**HON. LESTER L. WOLFF**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of my constituents, Jayne Schiff, who has through her own efforts and determination been able not merely to endure her physical disabilities, but to prevail over them as well.

Jayne was involved in an accident which severely damaged her spinal cord. In spite of this injury, however, she has continued to be interested in competitive swimming. As we are all aware, training for competitive athletics is a difficult, sometimes painful, ordeal even under the best of circumstances. It is surely an undertaking which tries not only individuals' physical stamina, but also their will to achieve and their desire to excel. In Jayne's case the challenge was especially difficult and required exceptional courage. I believe that is why notice of her achievement in the RECORD is especially well-deserved.

On June 17 Jayne set a new national record in winning the 200-yard freestyle swimming event in the National Wheelchair Games, which took place this year in San Jose, Calif. To win her gold medal, she had to swim the 8 laps in 4.41. Jayne was also awarded two silver medals for her second place finishes in the 25-yard butterfly and the 25-yard freestyle.

Mr. Speaker, individuals are always confronted with challenges. Some shrink from the task for want of incentive or for lack of inspiration. I believe that Jayne's efforts and accomplishments should be an inspiration and incentive to us all and should serve as a reminder that adversity need not be an impediment to achievement; it can also be an opportunity to excel.

#### PROPAGANDA CLOUDS THE REALITY OF GIVEAWAY TREATIES

**HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker we are currently being inundated with deceptive propaganda aimed at brainwashing the American people and their Representatives in Congress. The goal of this propaganda is to persuade them to accept proposed new giveaway treaties for the Panama Canal which were never authorized by Congress. As a result of this misleading propaganda, there is far more confusion about the realities of the situation and the treaties than understanding.

The projected treaties involve the disposal of territory and other property of the United States. Under article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution, this power is vested only in the Congress, which agency includes the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Among the veteran Washington correspondents who have closely followed the canal treaty question and written extensively on the subject over a period of years is Robert S. Allen.

In his syndicated column dated September 8, 1977, he summarizes the current situation in the Congress and emphasizes the power of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, because the indicated article by Colonel Allen should be of wide interest particularly in the Congress, I quote it here as part of my remarks:

(By Robert S. Allen)

Washington, September 8, 1977: There is a significant omission in the elaborately staged grandiose fanfare and hooplah glorifying the formal signing off the Panama Canal treaty.

It's the absence of recognition of the key role of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Imposing honors are being bestowed on the big-name participants of the U.S. Senate, but strikingly those of the House are virtually ignored. What attention they're getting is largely fleeting and incidental.

Yet the House is directly and crucially involved in the highly volatile battle over the Canal pact.

Without House concurrence, it will be basically meaningless.

That's due to the fact that the treaty involves the transfer of billions of U.S. property and the payment of hundreds of millions of dollars to a foreign country—and that can only be done by legislation voted by both branches of Congress.

So while the Senate has the constitutional function of ratifying treaties, in the instance of the Panama accord, the House will play an equally momentous role.

#### READY AND WAITING

Further, this vital legislation must originate in the House.

Not only will the House have first crack at it, but long-time opponents of a "Panama Canal giveaway", as they vehemently characterize it, are chairmen of the committees that will frame the legislation.

Foremost among these hostile die-hard crusaders are Representatives John Murphy, D-N.Y., chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee which has jurisdic-



tion over the Canal and Zone, and Daniel Flood, D-Pa., chairman of a key Appropriations subcommittee. It is the Appropriations Committee that will handle the huge financial aspects of the treaty.

These two powerful and strategically-placed House leaders are no johnny-come-lattes on the Panama Canal issue.

They had a lot to do with torpedoing President Lyndon Johnson's 1964 attempt to negotiate a Panama treaty. In the years since then, they have maintained a constant drum-fire of blasts against tampering with U.S. sovereignty over the strategic waterway and adjoining Zone.

Throughout they have had plenty of bipartisan backing. In the eight months of this Congress alone, more than 50 Republican and Democratic congressmen have sponsored bills and resolutions against a new treaty.

The real militant core of hardnose congressional opposition to the pact is in the House rather than the Senate.

For President Carter, that's where the rub comes in.

Because even though in the end he may pressure and wheedle Senate ratification, he still has a long way to go—and in many respects far rougher and more uncertain.

Getting the House to enact the so-called "implementing legislation" will be a truly monumental undertaking—with the odds heavily against him.

#### WARNING SHOTS

Graphically illustrative of what the President is up against are the following unsparing comments:

Representative Flood: "This giveaway treaty was not authorized by Congress. It's part of an organized and crafty communist conspiracy to wrest control of the Canal from the U.S. Panama is utterly incapable of operating the complicated canal. In 1955, when it assumed responsibility for its own sanitation, it was unable to collect garbage from the streets of Colon and Panama City.

"Prior to 1904, the Isthmus was the pest-hole of the world. Construction of the canal transformed the area into models of tropical health and sanitation. Panama has been and is the greatest single beneficiary of the canal, with total benefits from U.S. sources in 1976 of more than \$243 million."

Representative John J. Flynt, Ga., chairman of the Ethics Committee: "While under the Constitution, the House will not have a direct vote on ratification of the treaty, it will have a decisive voice in the appropriations process. The American people, overwhelmingly agitant relinquishing control of this indispensable defense and economic resource, can be assured the House will fully and forcefully exercise its authority on this all-important issue."

Representative Murphy, West Point graduate, has bluntly served notice on Administration leaders in the House that his committee will not consider any legislation dealing with the Canal issue this year. He told them, "We have too many other pressing matters awaiting action, and the Panama question can wait—particularly as a great majority of American people are against it."

"When Congress meets next year, we'll see how the situation is and decide what we'll do about Panama—if anything. One thing is certain: I have no intention of being rushed on this matter."

And that goes for scores of other House members facing unpredictable re-election campaigns.

As they see it, the ball is in their corner and they're going to call the turn and not the President. He needs them a lot more than they need him. As one tartly put it:

"He negotiated this treaty. The House didn't ask him to. So let him worry about it. Most of my constituents want no part of it, and neither do I!"

## FROM SOUTH DAKOTA—KEEP THE HATCH ACT

### HON. JAMES ABDNOR

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, during my August recess travels across South Dakota a number of citizens have expressed their concern over House passage of amendments to the Hatch Act. Most of them feel, as I do, that this act as it presently exists serves to not only protect Federal workers, but protects the public. They are hoping the Senate will not go along with the House in this matter. South Dakota views are pretty well summed up in this editorial from the Sturgis (S. Dak.) Tribune, a newspaper serving many Federal employees at a nearby veterans hospital, veterans cemetery, national forest, and Air Force Base:

#### RETAIN THE HATCH ACT

There's a serious effort underway in Congress to repeal the Hatch Act. That's the act that prohibits federal employees from holding elective office or participating in partisan political campaigns, those who favor its repeal contend that it discriminates against federal workers and violates their Constitutional rights.

The Hatch Act was originally enacted to remove politics from the Civil Service system. Until it became law the federal bureaucrats had subtle ways for coercing employees into supporting, both with contributions of time or money, candidates and programs with which they were not in sympathy. Much as labor unions have subtle ways of pressuring non-union workers into "joining up or else." It may be unconstitutional to force people to join organizations they'd prefer to pass up. But, believe us, it's being done in this land of the free and the home of the brave.

The Hatch Act, it should be pointed out, does not prohibit federal employees from voting for the candidates of their choice. But it does prevent them from spending money, which comes from the taxpayers, and devoting time, while under the employ of the taxpayers, for partisan political candidates and campaigns. Without the Act, workers who earn their livelihood at the public trough could conceivably lobby for candidates and programs that are unwanted by the taxpayers who support these workers.

The dangers of abuse might not be so disconcerting if the federal workers would become involved in partisan politics on their own time and with their own money. But the temptation to use governmental resources, including stamps, envelopes, addressing and duplicating machines, not to mention office hours, all financed by the taxpayers at large, for partisan political purposes might be overwhelming. There are zealots in every campaign who'll do anything needed to win. We have the sorry experience of Watergate as testimony to this fact, although it involved federal employees not covered by the Hatch Act. It's frightful to contemplate the possibilities of abuse if the lid was off of partisan political participation for all federal employees.

Frankly, we don't think it's asking too much that people whose livelihoods are provided at public expense be prohibited from holding elective office at the same time, and from becoming political partisans. As long as they have the privilege of the secret ballot, like all the rest of us, we don't think

they're being unfairly restricted by the provisions of the Hatch Act. It's served the country well over the years, although it's not been enforced to the extent we'd like, and, in our opinion, it should be retained.

## PROTECT MILITARY BENEFITS

### HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the trend in recent years has been to chip away at military benefits in order somehow, it appears, to get even with the U.S. military because they dared to follow orders and fight a no-win war in Vietnam against the Communists. The logic of this situation is upside down, because it was the national leadership of this country that engaged this Nation in a losing and futile effort and never gave our military a chance at victory. However, under the guise of economy, the trend to diminish or take away military benefits has continued. Therefore, I was pleased to note the editorial in the Washington Star on August 3, 1977, discussing why these so-called benefits are not only necessary but are earned by the military. The military falls into the same category as the police and firemen. You do not cut back on policemen and firemen benefits because crime and fire are increasing. And in the face of the growing Soviet juggernaut, we can ill afford to lower the quality of armed services by the steady erosion of benefits. The editorial follows:

#### PROTECT MILITARY BENEFITS

The Senate Armed Services Committee has completed hearings on bills that would prohibit members of the armed services from joining labor unions. Perhaps it will not be long before this legislation becomes law.

Until lately, the thought of labor unions in the military was so far-fetched that legislation hardly seemed necessary. But with some unions ready to mount organizing efforts on military installations the need for laws banning such activity has become obvious.

Yet Congress should not think that banning union membership will eliminate the climate that has led unions to view the military as a "fertile field" for organizing efforts.

A major element in producing this "fertile field" has been the constant criticism lately—and some actual erosion—of benefits to military personnel. Vietnam brought the military into disrepute in some quarters, making it a convenient whipping boy for politicians and a target for cost-cutters on Capitol Hill and elsewhere in government.

Every year, for example, military commissaries come under attack in congressional appropriations committees for making groceries available at discount prices. One would think from the criticism that the taxpayers are being ripped off to the tune of about \$300 million a year by well-heeled generals and admirals loading up on cheap foodstuffs, when in fact the vast majority of commissary customers are families of enlisted personnel, some of whose income is near or below the poverty level, and of lower-ranking officers, who are hardly getting rich in the military.

If the government can provide about \$80 million a year in subsidies for a few thou-

sand tobacco farmers to grow a substance demonstrably bad for health, what's wrong with subsidizing commissary operations by \$300 million a year to benefit about 2 million members of the armed services who are on call 24 hours a day to defend the country?

There's also been a hullabaloo lately about "double dippers"—retired military people who work for the government and draw civilian pay while continuing to collect military pensions. The fact is that most of these "double dippers" are enlisted retirees whose average retirement pay is around \$5,000 a year and whose civilian jobs are in the lower echelons of the civil service; but the critics focus on the 10 retired admirals and generals whose combined military pension and pay for top-level civilian jobs put their total compensation above that of Cabinet officers.

The "double dipper" controversy has triggered criticism of the entire military retirement system, which allows personnel to receive partial retirement pay after 20 years service and full retirement benefits after 30 years. Critics have suggested that early retirement be ended, that no retirement be paid before a certain age, that service personnel be required to contribute a portion of their active duty salaries toward retirement pay.

Nor are educational and medical benefits for the military what they used to be. And promotions come slower nowadays.

Add in the frequent long hours—there's no overtime pay in the military—the regular uprooting of homes, the frequent family separations, and the possibility of risking life in defense of the United States or an ally. It takes some dedication, if not rose-colored glasses, to see military service as a really attractive life.

The retirement benefits, the medical services, the commissary privileges and the rest were offered to induce men and women to join and make a career of the military. The fewer benefits, the less attractive it becomes; already the military is having difficulty filling quotas for the all-volunteer services, and there is talk of returning to the draft.

Yes, Congress should ban unions from the armed forces. But Congress also ought not chip away at military benefits and contribute to a climate that fosters unionism. Congress is, in effect, the shop steward to which military men and women look for protection of their rights, privileges and a decent livelihood.

#### VILLAGE OF KENSINGTON RECEIVES AAA SPECIAL CITATION

### HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into the RECORD due recognition of the Village of Kensington of the Sixth Congressional District of New York. On August 25, 1977, Mayor Marvin G. Florman announced that the town had received the AAA Special Citation for Casualty Record for no pedestrian fatalities for 45 consecutive years and no pedestrian injuries for 12 consecutive years.

The award will be presented to representatives of Kensington by Commissioner James Melton and president of the Automobile Club Harold C. Meyers at a special awards ceremony to be held at Tavern on the Green on September 19.

The AAA pedestrian safety inventory program evaluates comparable communities throughout the Nation. Awards are given to those communities who have compiled the best safety records for 1977.

My sincere congratulations to my neighbors the fine citizens of Kensington and their outstanding accomplishment; may they continue to set such a fine example for all communities.

#### TRIBUTE TO MRS. JOHNETTA HALEY

### HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, numbered among the many outstanding citizens of St. Louis is Mrs. Johnetta Haley. I would like to take this occasion to pay tribute to her for this most recent achievement. The article follows:

[From the St. Louis Sentinel, Aug. 11, 1977]

ELECTED TO BOARD OF CURATORS AT LINCOLN U.

Johnetta Haley, assistant professor of music at Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville, was recently elected president of the Board of Curators at Lincoln University in Jefferson City, Mo.

The board in the history of the university Mrs. Haley is the first woman president of which was founded in 1866. She was appointed to the board in 1975 by former Missouri Governor Christopher Bond.

Mrs. Haley received her B.S. degree in music education from Lincoln University in 1945. Her mother was graduated from the university in 1913.

The SIUE musician also attended the University of Illinois and Washington University in St. Louis. She received her master of music degree from SIUE.

Currently, she serves on the board of directors for the Metropolitan YWCA in St. Louis. Mrs. Haley was a chief organizer of the "World's Largest Garage Sale," sponsored by the YWCA in June at the St. Louis Gateway Convention and Exposition Center.

Mrs. Haley also serves on the Council of Lutheran Churches, Advisory Council of the Danforth Foundation's St. Louis Leadership Program and the Artist Presentation Society.

She holds memberships in Alpha Kappa Alpha service society, Mu Phi Epsilon professional music sorority, Pi Kappa Lambda music honor society and numerous professional and civic organizations.

Mrs. Haley is listed in Who's Who of American Women, Who's Who Among Black Americans, Who's Who in the Midwest, Notable Americans in Community Service and Who's Who Among the World's Musicians.

Before coming to SIUE in 1972, she was vocal music director and chairperson of the music department at Nipher Junior High School in Kirkwood, Mo. Previously she had been choral director at Lincoln High School in East St. Louis and an elementary music specialist in the Kirkwood Schools. She also worked with the Human Development Corp. and was director of the St. Louis Council of Black People in 1970.

In July, Mrs. Haley received the Distinguished Alumni Award from Lincoln University at the university's national alumni convention held in San Francisco.

A native of Alton, she now lives in Uni-

versity City with her husband, David. They have two children.

#### CARTER AND THE CHINA QUESTION

### HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, in appraising the Carter administration's efforts in foreign policy, namely the Soviet Union, the Middle East, Europe, Africa, and finally Asia, one is left with an uneasy feeling of not knowing whether progress is being made, the equilibrium is being restored, or whether we are following a detrimental course which will lead to the demise of the free world, as we know it today.

Today, and in the next few days, I would like to focus on the so-called China question and the Carter administration's efforts in that area. During the August recess, many articles were written on China and Secretary Vance's recent trip to the People's Republic of China. Many of these articles dealing with "normalization of relations" with Peking reflected the great doubts which many of us hold regarding our imprudent sacrifice of the Republic of China for equally doubtful assumptions of the benefits and advantages the United States can derive from relations with Peking.

I would like to share with my colleagues an article by Prof. Thomas Etzold entitled "Are 'Full Relations' Important to China?"

ARE "FULL RELATIONS" IMPORTANT TO CHINA?

(By Thomas H. Etzold)

In observing the China policy of the Nixon-Kissinger years and now of the Carter administration, I am reminded, sadly, of certain metaphysical disquisitions of the late Middle Ages. Then, learned men debated a fundamental question of human outlook, that of whether the earth was, or was not, the center of the universe. Of course it was not, any more than the United States today is the center of international politics. Yet, in approaching the issues of Sino-American relations, especially those surrounding the Taiwan-U.S. tie and so-called "normalization" of relations with Peking, the government of the United States appears to have persisted in a Ptolemaic view, an "Americacentrism" that distorts perception of how things fit together and, therefore, of what one should expect in the relations between China and the United States.

One misapprehension resulting from a Ptolemaic view is the notion that in relations with China the United States has influence naturally and by right rather than by circumstance. It is, however, wrong to imagine that the United States is central, or even very important, in the larger concerns of the Communist leaders of modern China. In a remarkable lack of perceptiveness, Americans have probably never realized adequately the extent to which the domestic reconstruction of China after 1949 overshadowed external affairs. The aim of the revolution was no less than to make a new society for a nation four or more times larger than the population of the United States, with a cultural and



political heritage some 30 times longer. Indeed, the Chinese seem to have established a priority for national policy often advocated for the United States in recent years, but never attained: internal affairs first and foreign affairs second.

Despite its relative unimportance in the overall Chinese scheme, the United States of late has received a lot of attention from China's chiefs. This has caused some befuddlement in the United States, for many Americans—including some who should know better—have mistaken these courtesies for indications that the United States has become more important to China; that this is a fundamental and enduring change; and that with certain adjustments on either side, a warm, substantial and profitable political-economic relationship might develop. The United States has only to withdraw from support of Taiwan and, in turn, the People's Republic of China will open its economy, country and culture, and perhaps take up a "constructive" role in regional and world politics.

But the reasons for China's regard for America's dignitaries are much less profound or promising than the Ptolemaic politicians, the wishful thinkers of Washington, would like to believe. For they arise from circumstances, not from any intrinsic American importance in the Chinese perspective. One reason for the amount of notice the United States has received in recent Chinese considerations—an obvious one—surely is the Sino-Soviet animosity. There is no doubt, as many have observed, that, much as we do, the Chinese seek to insure themselves against Russian menaces by playing at triangular politics, even to the point of seeking military sales and assistance from the United States.

Another such reason for the modicum of importance assigned to the United States in China's foreign affairs has been the American guarantee of Taiwan. Here there has been significant misperception on the American part. The Taiwan connection has grown into the central issue of Sino-American relations; it has been easy, though erroneous, to assume that similarly Taiwan has become something more for the Chinese than it has always been—namely, a peripheral, though contentious, matter alongside the problems of leadership and governance facing China's headmen.

It is evident that now, with the Sino-Soviet dispute in full swing and the security treaty with Taiwan intact, the United States has some influence, some standing, with the leadership of the People's Republic of China. It is not as evident, however, that in the long run the United States may well retain more influence by irritating Peking rather than by placating it. And here, perhaps, some explanation is necessary.

The first important fact to recognize is that the United States cannot ensure the long continuation of the Sino-Soviet dispute in terms that offer political advantage or require the Chinese to show solicitude for America's leaders and interests. Further, as George F. Kennan has noted in "The Cloud of Danger," it is precarious policy, poor statecraft, to base one's relations with another country on that country's bad relations with still a third. Nor is it in the interests of the United States to encourage dangerously hostile relations among any two other countries, much less such powerful ones as China and Russia. Such a policy can only make the climate of great power relations less agreeable for all, and somewhat more risky.

The second point of importance follows from the first: Precisely because the United States cannot depend on the continuation of advantage from a Sino-Soviet dispute, it must retain its connection with Taiwan, and

thus its ability to command some measure of consideration in the councils of the People's Republic of China. This may seem paradoxical. It has been more popular to argue, as have the officials of the PRC and their tame American academics and journalists, that once the shadow of the U.S.-Taiwan treaty is lifted, Sino-American relations will flower. But has anyone been observing how difficult it has been in the last several years to conceive just what would be the ingredients of "normal good relations" and how they would benefit the United States? China could scarcely do more than it does now to pin down Soviet military capabilities to the benefit of the United States and its Western allies. The U.S. government does not—and should not—wish to encourage China to political activism outside its borders. And the United States can, after all, absorb only limited quantities of tung oil and hog bristles, which are China's leading exports to America. Moreover, I would venture to say that, before long American Ping-Pong players will tire of being paddled to pieces by the wizards of wei-hai-wei.

Recently the administration has given increasing indication that it will move speedily toward full, "normal" relations with Peking, and, because it is critical to Peking's definition of "normal" relations, toward abrogating the defense treaty with Taiwan. The expectation is that great and good relations cannot be far behind. Yet one must suspect that this idea is nothing more than the 1977 version of the hoary China myth—if only every Chinaman would buy a shirt with a tail four inches longer!—that bemused Americans for generations, only to prove unfounded. There never was much substance either to the China market or to the Sino-American relationship. George Kennan, who otherwise favors abrogation of the defense treaty, made an important point both in his recent book and in an interview broadcast in December 1976: "I think," he said, "that [the Chinese] don't particularly like foreigners. I don't think they're terribly interested in us, and I think they're capable, along with their great delicacy of behavior, of great ruthlessness when you least expect it of them. I would feel that Americans ought to be very careful in their dealings with them."

In the long run, it is going to be more essential for the United States to get the attention of China than to remove the irritant of Taiwan from Sino-American relations. As things stand, only that relationship with Taiwan seems likely to assure the United States of a decent regard from Peking. It is up to the People's Republic of China to demonstrate how badly it wants full relations with the United States, and how much these may be worth both to them and to the United States. And for this demonstration, the United States can afford to wait; there is no need either for unseemly haste or for the imprudent sacrifice of an ally. If the United States does not pause, one must fear the day when America's relations with China may resemble nothing so much as comic lines in a tragic play:

"GLENDOVER. I can call spirits from the vasty deep.

"HOTSPUR. Why, so can I, or so can any man;

But will they come when you do call for them?"

Will the Chinese come? Will they even answer, when the United States has given in on the Taiwan issue and the terms of Sino-Soviet relations offer less opportunity? A modern-day disciple of Ptolemy would be certain of a positive answer. That in itself may be reason enough to be uncertain, and therefore cautious about seeing things in the manner of Ptolemy and doing things in the manner of Peking.

## POSTAL SERVICE: A VIEW FROM RURAL AMERICA—V

HON. JAMES ABDNOR

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, like most of my colleagues, I listened to a lot of comment concerning the Postal Service during the August recess. Most of the comment was not favorable. People in South Dakota are worried about losing Saturday mail delivery; they are a little suspicious that the proposed citizen rate mail may not be all it is cooked up to be; they are worried about soaring deficits and postage rate increases.

Their views are pretty well reflected in this series of editorials from South Dakota newspapers:

### CITIZENS OPPOSE CURTAILMENT OF MAIL SERVICE

Five-day-a-week mail service as has been proposed by the Commission for Study of the Postal Service?

"No" respond those who depend upon the mails, according to an Aberdeen American News survey of its readers, 85.7 per cent of whom . . . more than four out of five . . . opposed it.

Many obviously fear that reduction to five-day service, eliminating Saturdays, would be only a first step in continuing erosion of mail service.

Here are typical responses:

Ellendale, N.D.—"No; we do not favor five-day mail delivery, for the mail is our sole means of communication with the rest of the world. We are employed on a farm and depend on our daily newspapers."

Leola, S.D.—"No; I'm certain this could not stop a postage increase but only inconvenience the rural area. Items ordered by mail many times cannot survive the long delay."

Java, S.D.—"No; Congress should get rid of the wrecking crew and reestablish the old Post Office Department which was never intended for profit, but free delivery service to all."

Ashton, S.D.—"No; I don't believe the savings would warrant the demise of the once proud Postal Service. Five day, then three day, then no service at all."

Conde, S.D.—"No; if it was reduced to five days how many more offices and workers would have to be put on in Washington to institute this change. We need our Saturday mail."

Miranda, S.D.—"No; five day service will not improve service or save dollars. Even Zip code mail goes astray to Eureka, Northville, etc."

Faulkton, S.D.—"No; five days would delay news, especially newspapers. This is in complete disregard of the best interests of our small town businesses and their ability to communicate with outside interests."

Warner, S.D.—"No; I also think that the American News should keep reminding people to write to their congressmen about this five-day delivery bit. Because if they let them knock out Saturday delivery, the next thing the Postal Service will do is knock out another day of delivery and we could end up with two or three days a week."

Roscoe, S.D.—"No; we as farmers depend on six day mail route, both by getting our letters and by mailing letters in return."

Aberdeen—"Yes; if the day off is not Saturday. We are retired farmers and know what a disappointment that would be. Rural

people look forward to the mail and especially the paper."

The S. D. Postmasters Association at its recent state convention in Sioux Falls adopted a resolution opposing elimination of mail service on Saturdays. Many other groups have also opposed it.

Adds the Sioux Falls Argus Leader:

"A nation which can put its men on the moon and target intercontinental missiles within a hundred yards should be able to zero in on problems affecting such a basic government service as the U. S. mails."

#### TWO-TIER LETTER RATE APPEARS NOT TO BE SOLUTION TO POSTAL PROBLEMS

Many persons concerned about the problems and costs of mail delivery are unhappy over considerations of the Postal Service to establish a two-tier rate for first class letters.

It appears to them that in its confused effort to improve conditions the Postal Service is about to jump from the frying pan into the fire.

The Rapid City Journal said the proposal, suggested by President Carter, to boost the first class mail rate for business by three cents while holding the line at 13 cents for individuals smacks of populism rather than a sound economic approach to the Postal Service's fiscal problems.

The Journal said:

"From the administration's standpoint, holding the line on rates for individuals will ease the political pressure on President Carter to reassert White House control over the independent postal agency and to support large additional federal subsidies to keep mail rates from rising. Increasing these subsidies could upset the President's hopes of balancing the budget by 1981.

"In moving quickly to adopt the Carter suggestion, Postal Service officials are hoping the President will resist pressures to back legislation that would strip them of their independence.

"Politics aside, the two-tier system seems fraught with difficulties.

"While the rate break to the 20 per cent of the first class mail users who are individuals will total \$300 million a year, the savings to any one individual will be relatively small. But the task of policing the two-tier system to detect cheating could be both time-consuming and costly. We foresee the use of hundreds of inspectors to be sure some businesses don't try to take advantage of the citizen's rate not to mention the time and money spent to prosecute offenders.

"Charging businesses more for first class mail service may be politically popular but, as with any other cost of doing business, increased mail charges will be passed on to consumers in the cost of goods and services.

"If the Postal Service is to be self-supporting, all users should share in the cost of service. It costs the same to process and deliver a first class letter from IBM to a business client as it does a birthday card to grandma. The stamp on both should cost the same."

The Yankton Press & Dakotan called the "citizen's mail" vs. "business mail" solution one of the most ridiculous bureaucratic suggestions to come out of Washington in a long time. The Newspaper said:

"Being a little suspicious of almost anything the top dogs in the U.S. Postal Service do, it wouldn't surprise us a bit if this proposal is simply a smokescreen for the Postal Service to get its way on eliminating the Saturday delivery of mail—even though Mr. Ballar (postmaster general) didn't propose it in his recommendation to the Postal Service Board of Governors.

"We assume he thinks—and he's probably right—that there would be more flak aimed

at increasing the postage rates for business than he might get from eliminating the Saturday delivery—so the compromise can be made—regardless of how the six-day mail delivery service would cause great hardship in Rural America.

"And so we can assume, that if enough fuss is raised over the variable rate proposal—that the compromise would be the elimination of Saturday service.

"Neither should happen.

"If the United States Postal Service operated in the same businesslike manner that most businesses, which Mr. Ballar now proposes to penalize, many of the problems of that big agency could be overcome."

#### SAVE SATURDAY MAIL

Results of our survey concerning the proposed discontinuing of Saturday mail delivery re-emphasizes the vast amount of discontent by people in our trade area for the postal tailoring project.

The early response was overwhelming in opposition to such plans, with 183 or 190 responding indicating their discontent with the elimination of Saturday mail service.

The responses, coming from 54 different communities is a solid indicator of the feelings of the people in South Dakota. Where other newspapers have conducted similar surveys, the results have been equally onesided in opposition to the plan.

We are encouraged by the results of the reader response, but in effect, we must also reach Congress to direct our feelings to them.

There is a need to gain support from our federal lawmakers from all sectors of the country to establish the fact that the proposal is against the public wishes.

As our responses indicated, it will be a particularly difficult hardship placed on rural customers who already find some mail delayed a day. There can be no mistake about the feelings of our subscribers. They have, through their participation in this survey, indicated a given number of reasons for their concern.

Some of the responses from subscribers follow:

"I will be agreeable to curtail Saturday mail delivery when the Pentagon becomes self sufficient financially."

"Put a larger postal rate on junk mail. I feel it is discrimination against the rural people."

"We as heavily taxed farmers have a right for Saturday mail service."

"Loss of Saturday service means no newspapers, check, perishable items etc. Canceling Saturday service will cause large mail terminals to get behind as they do on holidays. How will they ever catch up?"

"The mail carrier is already complaining there is too much mail to carry and that a lot of mistakes are being made because of it."

"We are tired of being told what we have to do by people in Washington, D.C. We have some rights. We all pay taxes."

"How can it save money? They'll have to hire more people to take care of the Saturday build-up."

"What the postal department needs is a course in old-fashioned arithmetic. But too many are trying to get their hands on easy money."

The Daily Republic survey will be reported to our congressmen, but it is important that you take the time to write to your senators and representatives if you have not done so to express your feelings.

Sen. George McGovern, 2313 Dirksen Office Building, Washington, D.C.; Sen. James Abourezk, 1105 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.; Rep. Larry Pressler, 1238 Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C. or Rep. James Abdnor, 1227 Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

In addition, here are names and addresses of key subcommittee members that will decide the future of Saturday mail service.

Rep. James Hanely (New York), chairman of the House and Sub-committee on Postal Operations and Services, Room 239, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515; Rep. Charles Wilson (Texas), chairman of the House Sub-committee on Postal Personnel and Modernization, Room 2409, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515; and Sen. John Glenn (Ohio), Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Energy, Nuclear Proliferation and Federal Services, 204 Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510.

#### ANOTHER STUPID POSTAL PROPOSAL

If the United States Postal Service could improve its service as easily as it can cause confusion—we would have the best postal service in the world.

A case in point:

Just this week, Postmaster General Benjamin Ballar made it quite plain that the American Businessman will no longer be considered a "citizen" of this great nation of ours—at least from the standpoint of the USPS.

In one of the most ridiculous bureaucratic suggestions to come out of Washington in a long time was the suggestion of President Carter to establish a "citizen's mail" category with a discount on postage—and then to have it "seconded" by Ballar who went so far as to suggest that the first class postage rate for business be increased by three cents while holding postal rates for individuals at the current 13 cent rate.

Certainly Pres. Carter as a businessman is certainly aware that even the cost of labels on the jars of peanut butter must be passed on to the consumer—even though Mr. Ballar may not even have that much sense.

Certainly, any increase in postage for businesses will have to be passed on to the consumer—the same "citizen" who supposedly is getting a break on the postage rate under the proposal by Mr. Ballar.

Being a little suspicious of almost anything the top dogs in the U.S. Postal Service do, it wouldn't surprise us a bit if this proposal is simply a smokescreen for the Postal Service to get its way on eliminating the Saturday delivery of mail—even though Mr. Ballar didn't propose it in his recommendation to the Postal Service Board of Governors.

We assure he thinks—and he's probably right—that there would be more flak aimed at increasing the postage rates for business than he might get from eliminating the Saturday delivery—so the compromise can be made—regardless of how the six-day mail delivery service would cause great hardship in Rural America.

And so we can assume, that if enough fuss is raised over the variable rate proposal—that the compromise would be the elimination of Saturday service.

Neither should happen. . . .

If the United States Postal Service operated in the same businesslike manner that most businesses, which Mr. Ballar now proposes to penalize, many of the problems of that big agency could be overcome.

While we make no pretense of being a constitutional lawyer, we have grave doubts of having two different rates for the same class of mail. What legal definition can be used to differentiate between a "citizen" and a businessman?"

Whatever decision is made, the "citizen" who is supposed to get the break under the Carter-Ballar proposal is still going to have to pay in the end—and both of those men know it.

Aren't there more important things for the President of the United States to do?



Aren't there more businesslike ways to approach the problems of the U.S. Postal Service beside the "shotgun" approach we have seen used so often by Mr. Ballar and previous Postmaster Generals?

#### PEOPLE WANT 6-DAY DELIVERY

Brookings Daily Register subscribers are no different than people in other parts of the state who have responded to the question of five-day mail delivery. Through Thursday, 86 per cent of those responding to a straw vote do not favor dropping Saturday mail service. We, of course, couldn't agree more.

Gov. Richard Kneip has also gotten into the act, as evidenced by his recent letter to Rep. James Hanley, chairman of the House and Subcommittee on Postal Operations and Services. Here is part of the Governor's letter:

"One of my chief concerns is the recommendation calling for the elimination of Saturday mail service. In South Dakota, where three-quarters of the post offices are designated 'third' or 'fourth' class, our people are dependent upon the postal service as a vital link with other people and with all levels of government. They rely heavily upon newspapers to provide them with the most recent news, market and weather information, and the newspapers themselves are dependent upon the Postal Service for quick dissemination of the news at the lowest possible cost."

Kneip further said that to eliminate Saturday mail delivery would cause a delay in the delivery of both Friday and Saturday editions of daily papers, and in the case of a Monday holiday, it would mean delivery of Friday's news on the following Tuesday.

"I would have to believe that many subscribers would be discouraged because of these undue delays in receiving news and advertising, and I am strongly opposed to cutting service back to five days a week," Kneip said.

We hope that the strong support for six-day service voiced by rural areas will be listened to in Congress, even though the sparsely populated states like South Dakota, who have the most to lose, don't carry a lot of weight in Washington.

#### MYSTIFYING

President Carter's intention to oppose any change in the nation's postal system is, to say the least, mystifying.

The "business-like" Postal Service created by the Postal Reorganization Act of 1971 is now counting its deficits in the billions of dollars.

Rates for all classes of mail are rocketing upward at a pace which puts even the oil producers to shame. And all of this is occurring while basic services are being slashed with a meat cleaver. The morale and efficiency of postal employees has never been lower.

And President Carter proposes to do nothing? So it seems. On Sept. 8, according to published reports, the President will dispatch Bert Lance, director of the Office of Management and Budget to Capitol Hill to bury H.R. 7700, the postal reform bill which has generated such broad support because of its obvious merit, and its obvious necessity.

The President, it seems, does not agree that the Postal Service is a public service. He thinks the postal system should be run as a self-supporting business enterprise. And, evidently, he thinks the Postal Service has been doing a fine job of it.

H.R. 7700 is a broad-minded, realistic and workable approach to an issue which affects every individual and every organization in this nation: the crisis of our postal system.

It recognizes that there are problems with the existing system, and makes the hard deci-

sions on how to solve them. It recognizes the folly of doing nothing.

Before you go and kill H.R. 7700, Mr. President, do your fellow citizens a favor. Take a look at the facts.

#### CARTER BYPASSES CONGRESS

### HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, since the initialing of the proposed Panama Canal Treaties a few weeks ago, the news media have given widespread coverage to the provisions of the treaties. Unfortunately, most of the media fell into line with the White House propaganda that the giveaway was long overdue and well within the power of the President to negotiate.

However, a few of the more knowledgeable publications have seen through the White House distortions and presented objective analyses of the ramifications—not only of the giveaway itself—but of this unprecedented grab for power on the part of a would-be imperial presidency.

One such analysis is that given by Senator ORRIN G. HATCH in the September edition of the *Conservative Digest*. In his articulate and well-reasoned article, the Senator from Utah strips the treaty negotiations of the administrations' smokescreen of constitutional misinterpretation.

In summary, the Senator establishes conclusively that the negotiations have been conducted without regard to constitutional requirements and that they pose a threat not only to our Nation's security but to the ability of Congress to restrain raw Presidential power.

I commend this article to my colleagues:

#### PANAMA CANAL GIVEAWAY VIOLATES CONSTITUTION

Our venerable octogenarian, Ellsworth Bunker, veteran of more than 25 years service to the State Department, and Ambassador-at-Large directing negotiations with Panama for a new treaty, says that "the United States does not own the Panama Canal Zone." His assistant, Ambassador Sol Linowitz, claims that "the Panama Canal is a colonial enclave carried over from the early part of this century and which has caused bitter resentment and indeed hostility."

The story of the Panama Canal, as they tell it, is rather like the leftist folklore surrounding the history of capitalism. They would have us believe that "Yankee Imperialists" descended upon a helpless people, wrongfully took possession of the isthmus of Panama under the guise of a fraudulent treaty, and built a canal to exploit the Panamanians in the selfish interests of commerce and militarism.

Like the Greeks, Bunker and Linowitz now come bearing gifts. And what are these wondrous gifts? They are the gift of redemption for past crimes and sins against the people of Panama, and the prospect of better relations with our Latin American neighbors. To get them, we need only make a gift of the Panama Canal. Besides, America doesn't really need this Canal, we are told. What we really need, so far as the Canal is concerned,

is a clear conscience, a cleansing of the American soul, a real purging of guilt and shame. What better way to do this than by simply giving the Panama Canal away? Just so there are no hard feelings, we'll even go so far as to pay the Panamanians for taking it off our hands.

And so, negotiations begun under Secretary Kissinger in 1974 for a new treaty with Panama are now in their final stages. On July 29, President Carter met with American and Panamanian negotiators in the White House, and stated that he was pleased with the progress of negotiations and with "Panama's very constructive attitude." Expressing hope that the accord could be signed in time to bring it to the Senate before the Fall recess, Carter declared that the United States "will cooperate to the fullest degree to rapidly conclude an agreement for a treaty."

The last remaining obstacle, it appears, is the question of "conscience money." In addition to the territory of the Canal Zone and the canal itself, which are valued at approximately \$7 billion, the Panamanians demand \$5 billion for our continued use of the canal and the rental of military bases. Forget, if you will, that we already own all of this free and clear, and that the Panamanians already enjoy the highest per capita income of any people of Central America because of the annuities and other benefits derived from our Canal. But \$5 billion is apparently too much even for our "hard-headed" diplomats, who have indicated that "more realistic amounts" will have to be agreed upon before the treaty is concluded.

In anticipation of the ratification struggle that lies ahead, the negotiators have been preparing the American people for acquiescence by attempting to discredit the treaty of 1903. One device relied upon rather extensively is the familiar one of rewriting history. The object of this ploy is to lay a moral foundation for the surrender of the Canal by creating guilt feelings and redefining the terms of the original treaty.

Thus the advocates of a new treaty have come up with the novel idea that we don't really own the Canal after all, and must return it to its "rightful owners." The original treaty, they say, simply transferred "rights" in the Canal Zone rather than full sovereign control—even though such an interpretation flatly contradicts the expressed intent of the 1903 negotiators and the terms of the treaty itself.

They have also expressed the curious view that the Canal Zone is "leased" territory and that the United States pays a "rental" for its use. In truth, of course, the Canal Zone is not a leased area but a "grant in perpetuity" for the perpetual maintenance, operation and protection of the canal. What Panama actually receives is an annuity, not a rental.

Article II of the 1903 treaty grants to the United States "in perpetuity" the use, occupation, and control of the Zone—meaning ownership. The word "lease" does not appear in the treaty with reference to the Canal Zone; but the word "grant" makes nineteen appearances. The phrase "in perpetuity" occurs seven times. The treaty, unlike a lease agreement, contains no provision for renegotiation and no terminal date for the obvious reason that it was intended to be a final and absolute transfer of sovereignty in perpetuity. Though an embarrassment to the negotiators, these are facts which they can easily manipulate, if not ignore; for once the treaty is signed, the question of U.S. sovereignty over the Canal will become moot.

What the supporters of the treaty cannot ignore, however, are the political, military and legal realities of the situation. For one thing, General Omar Torrijos of Panama, who will take possession of the canal, is a dictator. His administration is riddled with Marx-

ists. These realities not only cast a cloud of suspicion on his intentions, but raise the issue of whether the Canal can be insulated against the harsh winds of ideology and political instability which so often sweep across Latin America. If the Canal were in the hands of this petty tyrant, the United States would surely find itself increasingly embroiled in Panama's internal affairs in order to maintain the Canal's security and protect the flow of Commerce.

For another, the American people are overwhelmingly against the giveaway of the Panama Canal. The drumming insistence of the negotiators that we must lie down and be sheared like sheep in the name of Latin American "justice" has not been convincing. More persuasive are American military leaders such as Admiral Thomas Moorer, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and three former Chiefs of Naval Operations, who recently informed President Carter that "under the control of a potential adversary the Panama Canal would become an immediate crucial problem and prove to be a serious weakness in the overall U.S. defense with enormous potential consequences for evil." Little wonder that recent public opinion polls show that the American people oppose a new treaty by a ratio of 5 to 1. They understand the realities of the situation, even if Bunker and Linowitz do not.

We may be thankful that many of our representatives in Congress are already antagonized by the Administration's methods and procedures. Resentment is widespread because the members have neither been informed of the substance of negotiations nor asked to authorize them—as is customary. Laboring at their self-appointed task in secrecy, the negotiators have defied our constitutional process, realizing that they lack congressional support and constitutional authority for their actions.

Though largely ignored by the press, constitutional issues of major proportions have recently surfaced in the Senate concerning the new treaty with Panama, adding another wrinkle to the controversy. One issue involves the economic assistance provisions of the treaty. The negotiators have not told Congress how much money will be given to Panama, or whether it will come in the form of a cash grant or loan package. But one matter is clear: a treaty cannot appropriate funds. The Constitution expressly provides that "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of Appropriations made by law." This means that the approval of both houses of Congress, and not just the Senate, must be given in order to validate this type of treaty. The Administration, however, has given no assurances to Congress that it will definitely seek implementing legislation regarding the economic and financial arrangements contained in the treaty.

The other issue is whether the President has the constitutional authority to transfer U.S. territory in the Canal Zone to the Republic of Panama by treaty and by-pass the House of Representatives. In hearings before the Separation of Powers Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee which I attended, legal advisors to the State Department argued that the President may make such a treaty because he possesses "concurrent" authority with Congress to give away U.S. property. Ratification of the treaty by the Senate, they stated, was all that was necessary. Under cross-examination, however, the witnesses were unable to give me a single valid judicial precedent for this extraordinary and unconstitutional view of the President's power.

My own studies lead me to the conclusion that the proposed treaty with Panama is unconstitutional, unless both Houses of Congress enact accompanying legislation authorizing the transfer of Canal territory.

Article IV of the Constitution states, "The Congress shall have the power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States." The courts have repeatedly ruled that this is an exclusive power of the full Congress. Any authority of the Executive to dispose of U.S. property, therefore, must first be derived from authority given by an Act of Congress.

In light of these considerations, a constitutional crisis is about to erupt between Congress and the President. There is no precedent in American history, to be sure, for the disposal by treaty, and without congressional authorization, of U.S. territory that has been acquired by purchase. Likewise, there is no precedent for the broad and sweeping exercise of the treaty-making power which the President is now claiming.

If he persists, and the Senate ratifies the treaty, Americans will lose more than the Canal, more than an important American territory, and more than a vital link in our strategic defenses and international trade. They will have lost another restraint on the powers of the President. "If the Executive is permitted to sidestep the House of Representatives on this vital constitutional issue of disposal of Canal property," John Murphy, Chairman of the House Merchant Marine Fisheries Committee recently observed, "it will try to sidestep the Senate on another issue, and the Judiciary on still another. The very fundamental precepts of the Constitution are at stake and we have already had one instance in which the Executive Branch attempted to expand its powers, resulting in the worst scandal in our nation's history—Watergate."

#### HEALTH EDUCATION PROGRAM

### HON. MATTHEW J. RINALDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of concern voiced recently about rapidly escalating health care costs. There also is the growing realization that the providers of health care services and health insurers cannot, by themselves, control these costs. Success in controlling the rate at which the costs of health care services increase requires the active participation of the individual.

We are beginning to realize that nothing we do will impact on the quality of life or the cost of health care as greatly as a lifestyle that includes good health habits. No matter how much money or "know-how" pours into health care, we cannot hope to overcome the physical destruction and financial deterioration resulting from poor health habits.

Realizing this, Blue Cross of New Jersey this year undertook an extensive program of health education emphasizing the importance of good health habits in ultimately reducing the incidence of health care needs, and thus controlling the rate of increase in the cost of health care services.

This widely praised program includes distribution of six health education booklets dealing with stress, nutrition, smoking, alcohol, childhood health problems, and taking better care of your body. To

date more than 150,000 copies of these booklets have been distributed as a result of personal contact with enrolled groups, advertising, and the cooperation of the State's press in making their readers aware of their availability.

Citations for this effort have been awarded to Blue Cross by the New Jersey State Senate, the American Cancer Society on the State and national levels and the New Jersey Affiliate of the American Heart Association.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to commend Blue Cross of New Jersey for its health education efforts on behalf of the citizens of New Jersey.

#### A STRANGE RHODESIAN PLAN

### HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, whatever one thinks about Rhodesia, many people feel that the present negotiations being carried on by U.N. Ambassador Young and British Foreign Secretary Owen are among the most bizarre in history. Here we have the strange scene of the United States and Great Britain negotiating for the Soviet backed terrorists and asking the Rhodesians to disband their army, which protects them from these terrorists and to accept some sort of U.N. peace-keeping army while a new army is formed. Do we need a repeat performance by the U.N. of its Congo intervention? One can imagine what sort of vision of slaughter to come this conjures up in the minds of the whites and the blacks who have cooperated with the Ian Smith government. The terrorists have won no battles. They have slaughtered many blacks, missionaries, and an occasional isolated farmer. Is this supposed to show support for their cause amongst Rhodesians? A thoughtful editorial on this matter appears in the Washington Star of August 26, 1977, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues. The editorial follows:

#### A STRANGE RHODESIAN PLAN

If the bewildering struggle over Rhodesia's future shows any intelligible pattern, it is a pattern of irreconcilable ambitions.

It is the belated ambition of Prime Minister Ian Smith, who has so long miscalculated the odds on the survival of his regime, to find a moderate black leader influential enough to negotiate with him the inevitable transition to "majority rule." Two candidates have emerged. One is Bishop Abel Muzorewa of the United African National Council, whose following among peaceful black Rhodesians is as great as his political clout is weak; the other, a late-comer to the internal peace movement, is the Rev. Ndabaningi Sithole, who recently returned to the country after an unsuccessful bid for influence in the militant nationalist ZANU organization, which has been hammering Rhodesia's borders in guerrilla raids from Mozambique.

On the other track, with a wholly different ambition, are the Russian-armed nationalist



fronts operating with the sanction of Rhodesia's neighbors. They seek an abrupt, and if necessary violent, end to the Smith regime. Their bloodthirsty raids on isolated Rhodesian farms and settlements, with innocent black laborers often the main victims, grow more audacious—and atrocious—every week.

On traditional Western political values and principles, it would seem that regardless of the political odds—which seem incalculable in any case—there is but one honorable course for Anglo-American policy. That is to support—if and where it is in earnest—the search for an internal negotiated solution, whether the vacillating “front-line” presidents approve or not. If on the other hand the terrorist course succeeds, as it might, it will set a shameful precedent, and will very probably result in the establishment of a hostile regime in Rhodesia from whose clutches white settlers and blacks with backgrounds of cooperation with the Smith government will be lucky to escape alive. The triumph of the terrorists may also open a vacuum for the intrusion of one of the Communist states, not unlike the Cuban presence in Angola.

Yet, astonishingly, the latest rumors about the British-American diplomatic initiative suggest that the lawful internal efforts and the outlaw insurrections are to be placed on an equal footing. According to an obviously leaked story from Lagos, Nigeria, British Foreign Secretary David Owen and U.S. Ambassador Andrew Young have devised a new plan to reconcile the irreconcilable, equating the Rhodesian army which is trying to protect the citizenry from illegal violence with the terrorists who wreak that violence. Both Prime Minister Smith and the insurrectionary organizations would be pressed to disband their armed forces and leave the task of keeping order in Rhodesia to a “peace-keeping” force of Nigerians. That’s right, Nigerians.

For all we know, this strange plan may commend itself to the world’s ethical sense, distorted as it is by a furious impatience with Mr. Smith’s ill-advised stubbornness. World opinion, at least as expressed at the U.N. and in official statements, attaches a mindless urgency to the single political value of “majority rule” for Rhodesia—a valuable principle to be sure, but hardly the only one at stake.

No observer of the Rhodesian tragedy, or of the recent history of sub-Saharan Africa, could honestly suppose that “majority rule” is any but a camouflage term for the ultimate rule of one or more of the many contending factions. What we are talking about, then, is probably in the upshot some kind of minority rule of Rhodesia other than Mr. Smith’s minority, probably militaristic in cast, possibly vengeful, and certainly less competent.

Some negotiated arrangement between Mr. Smith and Bishop Muzorewa or another black moderate, looking to a peaceful transfer of power, might approach the reality of “majority rule” in its accepted democratic sense. But the bishop has no armed divisions; and the firebrands seem determined to obstruct a peaceful settlement in any case.

As for the projected role of the Nigerian army, it is, if a serious proposal, the most startling of all the elements of the reported Young-Owen plan. Memories are short, but just for memory’s sake it may be in order to recall that in the late Sixties the Nigerian army was winning its spurs in a cruel, unconscionably bloody suppression of the Biafran secession, involving the slaughter of Biafrans by the tens of thousands. Peacekeeping force? The kind of peace the Nigerian army keeps would appear to be the peace for which another name is desolation.

## COORS STRIKE ISSUE EMPLOYEE RIGHTS, NOT WAGES

### HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, over the recess the Rocky Mountain News had an informative article on the issues in the now 5-month-old brewery workers strike against the Adolph Coors Co. I commend the article to the attention of my colleagues:

**BREWERY STRIKERS FIGHT FOR PRINCIPLES—RIGHTS, NOT WAGES, THE ISSUE IN 4-MONTH COORS WALKOUT**

(By Alan Cunningham)

Paul, Frank and Art sat around a table in a dark corner of the union hall on a gloomy morning last week and discussed their lives.

They are working men; anybody could see that by looking at them. But now they explained why none of them had worked during the past 138 days.

All are members of Brewery Workers Local 366. Since April 5, its members have been on strike against the Adolph Coors Co. of Golden.

In Washington, Albert J. Zack talked about the strike. Zack is the chief spokesman for the AFL-CIO, which has contributed funds to the walkout and endorsed a national boycott of Coors beer.

“These people are striking for a lot more than just wages and hours,” Zack said over the telephone. “They’re striking to protect themselves against an employer who seems to think he has the right to indulge in lie detector tests and padlock searches and other violations of individual privacy.”

The three men in the union hall can claim credit for 60 years and three months of service at the Golden brewery. But 58-year-old Art Harris accounts for half of that by himself. He went to work at Coors in January 1947. He’s been operating equipment that makes the beer ever since with the exceptions of the summers of 1957 and 1977.

Both of those years, he has spent the summer walking picket lines.

“It was a little different then,” he said of the earlier strike, which lasted 117 days, or three weeks shorter than this one has already run.

“We’re fighting for our rights this time. Last time, it was more or less about wages. Now it’s what they’re trying to take away from us.”

Harris recited the union’s grievances: the company wants to assign days off, shifts and vacations rather than give senior workers their preference; the company wants to use more polygraph tests; and Coors wants to require forced physical examinations whenever supervisors think an employee needs to take one.

With Harris were Paul Davidson, 51, who has put in a quarter century at Coors, and Frank Smith, 42, who is a relative newcomer, having started there about four years ago.

Smith was born without hands. Coors gave him a job as a “general brewery worker” or GBW. He does custodial work, taps kegs, pours beer in the lunch room and whatever else he is asked to do.

“The company was good enough to hire me, and I was grateful for that. I told them I would give them 100 per cent, and I done it. But I also promised to uphold the union, and now it’s their turn.”

“I just about broke twice and went in,” Smith said. “But I got sick to my stomach.

Besides, my kids was after me not to. I just decided to heck with it.”

He and his wife, Melanie, have three teenagers ranging from 14 to 17. At the start of this month, she went to work at an Arvada bank. It was a painful reality for Smith, who believes it’s the husband’s responsibility to support his family. It’s the first time Mrs. Smith has been employed since before the birth of their first child.

None of the men has worked since the walkout began. Harris, who is divorced, is living with his daughter, “or else I couldn’t get by.” Davidson said he had seen the strike coming and put money aside to prepare for the payless spell.

Many of the 500 or so remaining strikers have taken full- or part-time jobs. But some have had to abandon the fight. Their new employers required that they resign from the union and promise not to go back when there is a settlement.

Thus, the ranks of the strikers continue to erode. It has been a hard fight for both sides.

For the company, the strike came in a year when several unrelated factors caused them to take a beating in the marketplace.

In May, brewery executive Bill Coors said the company had run into a soft market and “an unexplained drop in consumption.” A recent article in the New York Times reported that the nation’s largest brewer, Anheuser-Busch, is engaged in a vigorous marketing struggle with the third largest firm, Miller Brewing Co.

It said these two firms are swallowing more of the market shared by the industry’s “big five”—including fifth ranked Coors.

For weeks after the strike began, Coors wouldn’t admit the boycott was affecting sales. But by mid-summer, the company was grudgingly conceding it had been hurt by the campaign.

All these developments seem to indicate that the company’s initial strategy of maintaining “business as usual” hasn’t been as successful as the firm hoped.

Harris and the others claimed that picket lines have reliable sources on what’s going on inside the brewery.

“They should have been up to making 80 brews a day now, and they’re only making 44,” Harris said. “That’s winter production,” he added contemptuously.

A “brew,” he explained, is 440 gallons.

“When we went out, it was at 64, and it was supposed to go up to 80. But I don’t think they ever went over an average of 50 this year.”

The strikers claimed the number of railroad cars being used to transport the brew out of the plant also had been reduced so sharply that Coors had turned 200 cars back to the railroad because they weren’t needed.

A company spokesman said Coors never had made its production figures public and didn’t plan to start doing so. He said the firm had no desire to get into a duel of claims and counterclaims about the amount of beer brewed.

But if things haven’t panned out well for the company this year, the summer has brought some disappointments for the strikers as well.

One of the unions’ chief disappointments came in mid-July, when an administrative law judge from the National Labor Relations Board came to Denver to hear charges that Coors had indulged in unfair labor practices during the dispute.

Confident that the charges had merit, the strikers had believed for weeks that they would win a favorable ruling, which would force the company back to the bargaining table.

But union officials were crestfallen when the judge announced at the close of the

hearing that he was going on vacation and planned to rule on several other cases first. He gave attorneys until Sept. 22 to file briefs.

Even if he rules quickly and the unions' assumptions should prove true, it is not likely that anything will happen to end the strike before October.

The AFL-CIO's Zack was asked whether the strike might not prove to be a long standoff, in which case the local might die without its members winning the opportunity to go back to work.

"I don't think the union will erode and die," he insisted. That it's going to be a long fight is pretty obvious, but when the fight started, everybody knew it wasn't going to be an easy one.

"There have been a lot of very long strikes in the United States, but because the fight is a tough one doesn't mean we give up. We're pretty stubborn people.

"I think there's a hell of a lot of people that don't like big people pushing little people around. Obviously, Coors are big people and the workers are little people and it's obvious as hell that they're tryin' to push 'em around."

His tone was more militant than that of the three striking workers in the union hall.

A trace of weariness crept into their voices as they repeatedly voiced disappointment about the lack of public understanding about their fight. They said the issue was often being portrayed as a demand for higher wages when that wasn't the case.

"It wouldn't cost him a dime for a fair contract," Smith said at one point, apparently referring to Bill Coors' brother, Joe. At another point, he quipped: "I would be willing to take as many polygraph tests as they want if only Bill and Joe would get on there and let themselves be asked if they gave us a decent proposal."

Harris reminisced about the other strike and a couple of short-lived walkouts in the 1950s. He contended that the present dispute centers around an effort by Coors to strip benefits won over the past two decades.

The others agreed, saying they would be happy if things could simply stay as they were.

"I think the whole union would settle for the old contract," Davidson declared.

"I know they would," said Harris.

#### UNITED STATES SHOULD KEEP PANAMA CANAL

#### HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply distressed that President Carter is attempting to give away the Panama Canal. I cannot understand why we should even consider turning over this valuable waterway to an unstable country ruled by a leftist military dictator.

The Panama Canal is of vital economic, military, and political importance. Approximately 70 percent of all the traffic through the canal either originates or terminates in American ports. All but 13 of the ships in the U.S. Navy—the exceptions being the giant aircraft carriers—can pass through the canal.

Hanson W. Baldwin, a former military correspondent for the New York Times and Pulitzer Prize winner, has written an excellent article in opposition to a Pan-

ama Canal giveaway. According to Baldwin:

The future security and well being of the United States are threatened by the Administration's proposed abandonment of sovereignty over the Panama Canal and the Canal Zone.

Following is the text of Baldwin's article which appeared in the August 20 San Francisco Chronicle:

#### TRANSFER OF SOVEREIGNTY THREAT TO U.S. SECURITY (By Hanson Baldwin)

The future security and well-being of the United States are threatened by the administration's proposed abandonment of sovereignty over the Panama Canal and the Canal Zone.

Any such action would have global consequences, nowhere more adverse than in the Caribbean Sea-Gulf of Mexico area. The vital interests of a nation can be defined in territorial and regional terms or as political, psychological, economic, or military interests. By any and all of these yardsticks, the security of the Caribbean, the ability of the United States to control the Caribbean in war and to be a dominant influence there in peace, is vital to our country.

Yet that capability has already been gravely weakened; the turning point was the Communist's seizure of power in Cuba, the Caribbean's most important island, only 90 miles from our shores.

It is in this broad perspective—the future of the Caribbean-Gulf of Mexico area—that any basic change in the status of Panama Canal must be judged.

It is ironic, indeed, that in an era when the United States Navy needs the canal to a greater degree than any time since end of World War II, Washington is considering its abandonment. The navy today is in the same strategic bind it was prior to World War II: it is a one-ocean navy (in size and power) with two-ocean responsibilities.

While the 13 giant aircraft carriers of the U.S. Navy have too large a beam to pass through the 110-foot width of the present locks, well before 2000 a new generation of ships will begin to replace them—smaller, but more effective, with advanced weaponry.

Every other ship in the U.S. Navy can transit the canal, a fact of major importance in limited war, the type of crisis we are most likely to face.

The Panama Canal Zone offers facilities unavailable elsewhere under the U.S. flag for training troops in jungle warfare. More important, the zone is oriented towards the problems of Central and South America, and the zone's army schools and training facilities have fostered and helped to develop a close and productive military liaison between the armed forces of many nations in the southern hemisphere and the United States.

The economic factor is also of major importance to the canal-Caribbean equation. To the American economy, and particularly to U.S. overseas shippers and importers, the canal has major importance; it has been estimated that, of all cargoes transiting the canal in ships of all flags, about 60 to 70 per cent are bound to or from U.S. ports.

One of the plans for transporting the oil of Alaska's North Slope to the hungry markets of the "lower 48" contemplates shipment by tanker through the Panama Canal Gulf and East Coast ports.

Even more compelling than the military and economic importance of the canal are the political and psychological considerations. As the Pueblo, Mayaguez, and other

incidents have shown, even second- and third-rate powers now dare to tweak Uncle Sam's nose.

This process of losing not only face and prestige, but also control, has gone far in the Caribbean; it will accelerate greatly if we abandon the canal.

Contrary to those assertions from public officials who should know better, we did not steal the canal, nor does Panama have residual, titular, or any other kind of sovereignty over it. The United States bought the canal territory—a strip across the Isthmus of Panama some 50 miles long and ten miles wide—at a cost to the American taxpayer that far exceeded that of any other territorial acquisition.

The answer from those who advocate retreat evades the issue. American supporters of a transfer of sovereignty to Panama try to make the shift seem a minor adjustment which will ensure happy relations with a friendly and stable Panama and stress that "control" of the canal would remain in our hands.

But without sovereignty it is clear that we shall not be able to carry out the terms of the Hays-Pauncefote treaty with Britain, nor shall we be able, regardless of the wording of any attempted compromise solution, to "control" the canal.

If we transfer sovereignty over the canal to Panama—an act that seems to be, under the Anglo-American treaty, legally questionable unless Britain agrees—we should leave the isthmus, lock, stock, and barrel; our "control" would become completely ineffective, probably after protracted wrangling, unending disputation, and perhaps repeated clashes.

We cannot insure control without sovereignty; the mere phrase is doublespeak. We cannot provide military security for the canal without sovereignty; to attempt it would be to accept responsibility without authority.

#### EL CAJON TEAM CAPTURES RUNNER-UP SPOT IN 1977 LITTLE LEAGUE SERIES

#### HON. CLAIR W. BURGNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. BURGNER. Mr. Speaker, I just want to take this opportunity to salute the El Cajon little league baseball team, which captured second place in the recently concluded little league world series at Williamsport, Pa. After disposing of some of the best little league competition in the West, the El Cajon team demonstrated their diamond supremacy over the best teams in the Nation and moved into the little league world title game against the Taiwanese team.

Although the Taiwanese have dominated series play for the last decade, the El Cajon team turned in the most respectable game an American team has played in years against the Taiwanese, as the Californians were "in the game" all the way.

Mr. Speaker, the El Cajon little leaguers made all of us proud, not only because of the way they played, but because of the way they conducted themselves. These young men are the best ambassadors of good will a city could



possibly have, and I would just like to tip my cap to the players, managers, coaches, and others involved in the El Cajon little league program. They have shown us they are the best—not only of the West—but of the United States.

## TWO PAPERS BY MARYLAND HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

### HON. NEWTON I. STEERS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. STEERS. Mr. Speaker, this summer I sponsored a 3-week seminar for 44 outstanding high school seniors from my district who examined our Government through a series of speakers and field trips.

At the conclusion of the program, the students submitted papers on current topics which they were able to study through the Library of Congress congressional reports and interviews.

I have submitted for inclusion in today's Record, two of these papers.

The first paper, "Congressional Policy on Illegal Aliens," is by Babette Salus, a senior at Montgomery Blair High School in Silver Spring. Babette, 17, is a member of the National Honor Society and a member of a symphonic band.

The second article, by Sharon Plunkett of the Academy of the Holy Cross in Rockville, examines U.S. policy toward Cuba. Sharon, also 17, is editor in chief of her high school paper and president and founder of her school's Political Science Club.

The two articles follow:

#### CONGRESSIONAL POLICY ON ILLEGAL ALIENS

(By Babette Salus)

Due to an economic imbalance between the United States and almost half the other countries of the world, an exorbitant number of illegal aliens, somewhere in the vicinity of five to eight million, from at least fifty-nine countries, have entered the United States. Illegal aliens, foreigners who either enter the United States unlawfully, or who enter legally, but after admittance violate the terms of their entry, usually by overstaying or by accepting unauthorized employment, come to the United States with hopes of finding employment. It is because of this motive that "The primary impact of the illegal aliens in the United States is believed to be on the labor market."<sup>1</sup> The staggering number of illegal aliens, approximately 770,000 a year, entering the United States has been a matter of great concern in Congress for the last seven years. Despite the interest Congress has shown in reducing the number of illegal aliens entering the United States, the legislation passed seems to be inadequate if a long term solution to the problem is to be achieved.

At the present time, "The basic U.S. law governing immigration is the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended."<sup>2</sup> This act defines an alien as "any person not a citizen or national of the United States."<sup>3</sup> It also states the distinction between immigrants and nonimmigrants as aliens admitted for permanent residence and aliens granted temporary admission, respectively. The act sets the immigration ceilings and criminal sanctions for illegal entry. Although

this act "defines the smuggling, harboring, transporting, or encouraging of illegal entrants as felonies," the Southwest proviso passed in 1952, states that employment of illegal entrants does not constitute harboring and therefore is not a felony.

Two very significant groups of amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 are those passed in 1965 and in 1976. The major point of the 1965 amendments was that the national origins quota system would be replaced by a ceiling on Eastern and Western Hemisphere immigration beginning July 1, 1968. Immigration from the Western Hemisphere was to be limited to 120,000 people a year, the Eastern Hemisphere to 170,000. The 1976 amendments set an annual limit of 20,000 immigrants per country in both hemispheres, a limit which previously had been in effect only in the Eastern Hemisphere. The 1976 amendments also extended, to both hemispheres equally, a modified version of the seven-category preference system giving priority to family members, people with desired skills, and refugees.

In an effort to deal with the illegal alien problem, Congress has also amended several other laws and regulations. In 1974, Congress amended the Farm Labor Contractor Registration Act of 1963 to include criminal penalties for unregistered farm labor contractors who knowingly engage the services of illegal aliens. In 1972, Congress passed an amendment to the Social Security Act centered on cutting back the use of social security cards for employment purposes by non-citizens not legally entitled to work. It was also attempted to reduce the participation in Federally funded benefit programs by the illegal aliens. In addition in 1974, Congress amended the Farm Labor Contractor Registration Act of 1963 to include criminal penalties for unregistered farm labor contractors who knowingly engage the services of illegal aliens. By restricting benefits to citizens and legal aliens and by creating more strict penalties for the conscious hiring of illegal aliens, it was hoped by Congress, that the incentive for aliens to come illegally into the United States and for United States employers to hire them would be lessened.

On January 11, 1977, Joshua Ellberg introduced H.R. 1663 which would amend the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. The proposed legislation in summary:

"Amends the Immigration and Nationality Act to make it unlawful for any person knowingly to employ, continue to employ, or refer for employment any alien in the United States who has not been lawfully admitted for permanent residence, unless the employment of such alien has been authorized by the Attorney General. Establishes a three-step procedure for the imposition of civil and criminal sanctions against employers violating the provisions, and also provides for an injunctive remedy. Authorizes civil action by the Attorney General in the event of alleged discrimination regarding employment on the grounds of national origin. Provides for the regularization of status of certain illegal aliens who entered the United States prior to June 30, 1968."<sup>4</sup>

The House Judiciary Committee of the 94th Congress found that the primary reason for the illegal alien problem was the economic imbalance of the United States and other countries, with the greater chance of finding employment in the United States. On the basis of this finding a series of bills was written prohibiting the knowing employment of illegal aliens and establishing a series of administrative, civil and criminal penalties for violators of this prohibition. There are, however, two reasons why these and other pieces of legislation concentrating on the illegal alien issue are not successful in solving the problem.

The first is that the laws are not carefully enforced. A great deal of the impact of illegal aliens in the United States is due to the violations of the existing legislation by the aliens, employers and administrators of public welfare programs. If labor standards were enforced on the employers of illegal aliens, it would be of no advantage for the employers to hire illegal aliens.<sup>5</sup>

However, even if the current laws on illegal aliens were more effectively enforced, a successful, long-range solution to the problem would not be achieved. This is because the legislation which Congress has concentrated on so far does not deal with the causes of the problem, but rather its effects. If, relatively speaking, no jobs were available in the United States for illegal aliens, they would still come to the United States in the hope of finding "non-existent" jobs or getting on a Federally-funded benefit program. As long as the economic state of Mexico, from where 89% of the illegal aliens come, remains unstable and the unemployment rate high, approximately 40%,<sup>6</sup> the people who are starving will go elsewhere in search of basic human needs. Therefore, the long-range solution to the problem can only be reached when Mexico achieves economic stability.

One possible solution to the problem would be a program based upon temporary employment permits, controlled by both the United States and Mexico, which would expire after 180 days. These would be issued to a limited number of Mexicans for work in the United States. The permittees would earn the same wages as United States residents, with the bulk of their earnings being spent in Mexico after their return. The United States government would collect the same taxes from these aliens as it does from residents. However, since it would not have to supply so much in the way of Federally-funded benefit programs for these aliens as it does for its residents, a portion of the collected taxes would be forwarded to Mexico. This program would help the Mexican economy by lowering the unemployment level there, with an associated gain in Mexican revenues and taxes by reason of the new capital. The United States would have to enforce its labor laws more strictly with particular attention to the holders of temporary employment permits to make sure they do not overstay.

In addition to any alien labor program which may be devised, the United States is going to have to aid Mexico in large scale trade. The economy of Mexico will not stabilize without increased trade.

The legislation before the 95th Congress, like that of the 92nd, 93rd, and 94th Congress, does not form a very optimistic approach to the permanent termination of illegal immigration. The legislation attempts to reduce the effects of the result, the high immigration, rather than diminish the causes of the problem, the economic upset coupled with the promising job market of the United States. Even if the legislation as written could solve the illegal alien situation, it would not until enforcement was improved. The only way the United States is going to achieve a permanent solution to this problem is to devise a controlled labor plan, to enforce that plan, and to assist the countries from which the illegal aliens come, mainly Mexico, in stabilizing their economies.

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> Viallet, Joyce, *Illegal Aliens: Analysis and Background*, Washington, D.C., Congressional Research Service, February 1977, p. 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 51.

<sup>3</sup> McCarran-Walter Act, Act of June 27, 1952, Public Law 414, 82nd Congress, 66 Stat. 163.

<sup>4</sup> Viallet, Joyce, *Immigration: Illegal Aliens*, Washington, D.C., Congressional Research Service, May 1977, pp. 3-4.

<sup>5</sup> Viallet, Joyce, *Illegal Aliens: Analysis and Background*, Washington, D.C., Congressional Research Service, February 1977, p. 133.

\* U.S. News and World Report, "Time Bomb in Mexico," July 4, 1977, p. 27.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Time Bomb in Mexico," *U.S. News and World Report*, July 4, 1977, pp. 27-34.

Violet, Joyce, *Illegal Aliens: Analysis and Background*, Washington, D.C., Congressional Research Service, 1977.

Violet, Joyce, *Illegal Aliens: Existing Legislation and Legislative Action in the 92nd and 93rd Congresses*, Washington, D.C., Congressional Research Service, 1975.

Violet, Joyce, *Immigration: Illegal Aliens*, Washington, D.C., Congressional Research Service, 1976.

## U.S. POLICY TOWARD CUBA: IN DIRECTION OF NORMALIZATION

(By Sharon Plunkett)

The relationship between the United States and Cuba was severely handicapped from the time Fidel Castro took over Cuba in 1959. After the overthrow, the two nations adopted very opposite policies. Cuba expropriated all property owned by U.S. citizens, supported uprisings in neighboring Caribbean countries and instituted the Communist system of government. The United States halted their economic as well as military aid and placed an embargo on exports to and imports from Cuba. Furthermore, the Bay of Pigs invasion in 1961 and the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962 just widened the rift between the two countries. On January 3, 1961 the U.S. broke diplomatic and economic ties with Cuba.

The U.S. policy toward Cuba has been based upon the Cuba Resolution of October 3, 1962. This resolution was instigated because of congressional reaction to Soviet military buildup in Cuba.

The resolution stated that "the U.S. is determined to prevent by whatever means sphere." It also declared that the U.S. "would prevent in Cuba the creation or use of an army or the threat of force, its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this hemisphere supported military capability endangering the security of the U.S."<sup>1</sup>

U.S. policy was also based on two decisions taken in the Organization of American States in 1962 and 1964. In 1962 the OAS decided to exclude Cuba from the organization. In July, 1964, the OAS took action to impose sanctions on Cuba because of Venezuelan charges of smuggled weapons to pro-Communist guerrillas.

During the past, U.S. policy toward Cuba has changed because of various actions to normalize relations. This paper will show just how the U.S. is trying to normalize their relations with Cuba.

Since 1971, the U.S. has been trying to improve relations. Many Senators have called for a reexamination of our policy toward Cuba. During 1971, Senators Frank Church, William Fulbright, and Charles Mathias took action to repeal the 1962 Cuba Resolution.

Since 1973, both countries had given promising indications that their policy toward one another was softening. During 1973, Cuba and the U.S. signed an anti-hijacking agreement. Statements made by President Ford and Secretary of State Henry Kissinger suggested changes from Mr. Nixon's policy. Even the OAS in 1975 voted to lift certain aspects of the embargo and as of April 1977, eleven Latin American nations had reinstituted diplomatic relations with Cuba.

Since the fall of 1976 and with the election of President Carter the movement toward normalization of relations looks very encouraging. The President has indicated this by the further liberalization of U.S. restrictions on Cuba. Also shortly after taking office the

President secretly ordered an end to the SR-71 reconnaissance flights over Cuba.

The latest movement toward normalizing relations was the April signing of agreements on fishing and maritime boundaries in Havana. These agreements are a new beginning in U.S.-Cuban relations.

Other efforts have also been made to help relations. Recently, Senators McGovern and Abourezk visited Cuba. During their visit they talked to Castro and reported back to the President on some of his comments.

The U.S. House of Representatives voted down an amendment to the Foreign Relations Authorization Act "which would have prevented funds from being used for negotiation of reestablishing diplomatic relations with Cuba."

Also a Gallup poll taken on reinstituting diplomatic relations showed 53% in favor of normalization of relations and 1/2 opposed to the move.

While the U.S. is trying to normalize relations, Cuba is also showing their effort. On June 22, 1977 Cuban officials granted their consent for the resumption of cruise line service between a U.S. port in New Orleans and Havana since the break in relations.

Even though diplomatic relations have been going well since 1976 some people are still in opposition to normalization because of Soviet influence, Cuban involvement in Angola and Puerto Rico, compensation for expropriated property, the Guantanamo Naval Base, the sugar issue, the trade embargo, and the political prisoner question.

The Soviet influence in Cuba is a reason for normalization because with normalization our stand with the Soviet Union might improve and it could also promote trilateral discussions between Cuba, the Soviet Union, and the United States.

Cuba was involved in Angola but the Cubans have said that half of their troops have been withdrawn. They also stated that the Army would not become involved in Southern Africa. Concerning the involvement in Puerto Rico, President Carter said that serious discussions of this matter should be held with the Cubans.

The sugar issue and the claims for expropriated property are not major obstacles in normalization. With the case of the sugar, the U.S. and other sugar-producing countries could get together and in time, solve this problem. It would not be reasonable to wait before this issue is all solved before normalization occurs. The claims for expropriated property is also not an issue because it could be dealt with after relations are normalized.

In reference to the Guantanamo Naval Base, this is not as hot an issue anymore in normalizing relations to Fidel Castro. At first he demanded that the U.S. give up Guantanamo. The Cuban Foreign Ministry officials now have softened their position. They said the U.S. would have to make a "willingness to negotiate." At least with this position, the U.S. could talk and some kind of compromise could result out of this issue.

A real concern to Castro about normalizing relations was the lifting of the embargo. On May 10, 1977, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee voted to partially lift the embargo against Cuba and to permit the export of agricultural supplies, food, and medicines. This amendment to the State Department authorization bill was a modification of an earlier amendment proposed by Senator McGovern. This "partial" lifting of the embargo could lead to the "whole" lifting of the embargo. This is surely a possibility for the future.

Recently, the political prisoner issue along with human rights has been a top priority with the normalization of relations. This

issue is important but should not be a factor in normalizing relations because the U.S., even after criticizing, maintains relations with countries like Chile, Brazil, and the Soviet Union, who were charged with having political prisoners and treating them unfairly.

Carter's very outspoken statements on human rights has been cited as an obstacle in relations with Cuba. At the present time, this is true but once countries understand President Carter, his human rights issue may be much more of a help than a harm. In time, this issue will become comfortable enough so countries will be able to talk intelligently about this and come to a solution.

There are also other topics that are believed to be in the way of normalization. These are Cuba's use of export of subversion, and the OAS.

Cuba is not as dangerous to peace and security in Latin America today as it was in the 1960's because Castro no longer uses export of subversion as a revolutionary symbol. Also the Department of Defense has stated that within the past few years the level of Cuban-supported revolutions has decreased.

The OAS embargo on Cuba was held firm until 1970 when Chile resumed trade and then diplomatic relations with Cuba. Since that time, eleven countries have recognized Cuba. In July, 1975, the OAS passed a resolution which gave each member-nation the right to make its own decision about relations with Cuba. This decision was supported by the U.S. and signaled an end to the eleven year ban on Cuba. These actions of the OAS are not an obstruction but a help to normalize relations.

Before and during 1961, the U.S. was opposed to Communism and the Soviet impact on Cuba. But today, the U.S. has somewhat accepted Cuba and is interested in benefits that could be gained from normalization with this unique government.

There are some political as well as economic benefits to be derived from a change in U.S. policy toward Cuba. Aside from reducing international tensions, especially those within the Western Hemisphere, improved relations could lead to reduced Russian military influence in Cuba. Recognition could provide economic development in the Caribbean area if Cuba was included in an economic program.

If U.S.-Cuban relations normalized Cuba would be a very important trade partner. A Cuban official told Minnesota businessmen, who were visiting Cuba, that U.S. trade with Cuba could total \$1.5 billion within one or two years after normalization occurred.

Finally, the reintegration of Cuba into the Inter-American system, the OAS, would make a whole out of the Western Hemisphere idea. "Cuba by history, language, religion, culture, and tradition is part of the Western Hemisphere and it is only natural that the island nation be part of it again."<sup>2</sup>

It is about time that the U.S. is seriously negotiating and trying to normalize relations with Cuba. This time is long overdue and at the rate the two nations are trying to become friends again they will soon achieve this promising goal.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sklar, Barry, *Cuba: Normalization of Relations*, The Library of Congress Congressional Research Service, May 17, 1977.

Sklar, Barry, *U.S. Policy toward Cuba: A Pro-Con discussion on the Resumption of Relations*, The Library of Congress Congressional Research Service, February 9, 1972.

<sup>2</sup> Barry Sklar, *U.S. Policy toward Cuba: A Pro-Con discussion on the Resumption of Relations*, p. 38.

<sup>1</sup> Barry Sklar, *Cuba: Normalization of Relations*, p. 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 13.



## THE BO CALLAWAY CASE

## HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. President, in the August 1977 issue of *Colorado Business* Senator FLOYD HASKELL had an opportunity to discuss charges made earlier in that magazine, as well as in Harper's, that the inquiry by his Subcommittee on Environment and Land Resources into former Army Secretary Howard "Bo" Callaway's role in obtaining Government approval for the expansion of his Crested Butte, Colo., ski area was an election year stunt with little or no basis in fact.

Senator HASKELL correctly presents the issue in the Callaway case: "Did he attempt to use his high office to influence a Government agency to act favorably toward his private interests—his ski corporation?" And he points to two earlier cases—one during the Kennedy administration and the other during the Eisenhower administration—in which top Government officials resigned under circumstances similar to those presented in the Callaway case.

The full article follows:

SINCE YOU ASKED ME . . .

(By Floyd K. Haskell)

Your columnist, Paul FitzPatrick, indulged himself in your July issue. His stimulus, of course, was the Harper's magazine article on my inquiry into Howard "Bo" Callaway's role in the proposed expansion of his Crested Butte, Colorado, ski area.

Mr. FitzPatrick's column did not betray his background—which includes stints on the staffs of Republicans Sen. Peter Dominick and Rep. Mike McKeivitt and duty last fall in Republican Ed Scott's campaign against Democrat Tim Wirth in Colorado's Second Congressional District.

Colorado/Business readers deserve to know how one newsman who covered the inquiry—and a Pulitzer Prize winner at that—viewed the Harper's article. NBC's Jim Polk characterized it for the Rocky Mountain News as "selective journalism" which practices the very "distortion" it accuses me of. Mr. Polk also said the author of the piece used "cheap shot tactics."

As to my interest in Mr. Callaway's conduct, the issue was very simple: did he attempt to use his high office to influence a government agency to act favorably toward his private interests—his ski corporation?

The public record leaves no doubt that Mr. Callaway did indeed seek to use the fact and the trappings of his office in an attempt to influence Forest Service decisions in his corporation's favor.

Another generation of Republicans, for example, would remember an incident involving Fred Korth, Navy Secretary under John Kennedy. When the smokescreen finally cleared, the nation learned that Mr. Korth had used Navy Dept. stationery to write personal business letters. Like Mr. Callaway who also wrote personal business letters on official stationery, Mr. Korth freely admitted it. Also like Mr. Callaway, Mr. Korth denied he had done anything criminal or in violation of departmental conflict of interest codes. And, like Mr. Callaway, Mr. Korth missed the point.

The Justice Dept. found that Korth was not guilty of a conflict of interest. But Korth was asked to resign for violating standards set down by Kennedy for his administration in 1961. They declared: "Even though a technical conflict of interest . . . may not exist, it is desirable to avoid the appearance of such a conflict from a public confidence point of view."

A few years and one administration earlier, Harold E. Talbott resigned as Secretary of the Air Force under similar circumstances.

As the New York Times described it, "At issue in the Talbott affair were the Secretary's activities from his Pentagon office" in behalf of an engineering concern in which he held a partnership.

Talbott asserted his activities had been "within the bounds of ethics." President Eisenhower, in accepting the resignation, termed Talbott's decision to resign "the right one." He said officials of his Administration must behave "impeccably from the standpoint of ethics" as well as legality.

Sen. Wayne Morse, Democrat of Oregon, said, ". . . on the basis of his indiscretions and his publicly admitted mistakes, Mr. Talbott ought to be kicked out of office." In essence, he was. And even Republican senators thought it was the right decision—both for Talbott and the President. Sen. Mundt cited the President's response as evidence of his administration's integrity.

I think Mr. Callaway's conduct in the 1975 expansion of his corporation's ski area and in an earlier 1973 incident place both his feet in the latter camp. The 1973 incident was of interest to the subcommittee mainly because it showed that what happened two years later was no aberration; it was part of a pattern whose efficacy had been clearly demonstrated.

On July 19, 1973, the Crested Butte Development Corp. applied for the addition to its existing ski area permit of a parcel of public land known locally as Tony's Parking Lot. The Forest Service informed ski area officials the addition could not be made without an environmental impact statement. Mr. Callaway involved himself in the issue in October through an old friend in the Agriculture Dept. arranging for ski area officials to meet the high-level Forest Service officials in Washington, completely bypassing an appeal to the regional forester in Denver.

The Washington meeting initially produced only a reiteration of the Forest Service's denial. But in February, 1974, Ralph Walton, who is Mr. Callaway's brother-in-law and a ski corporation official, contacted the old family friend, Richard Ashworth, in the Agriculture Dept. to push the request again. Ashworth called the chief of the Forest Service, John R. McGuire. McGuire called the assistant regional forester in Denver. Twenty-four hours later, that official telephoned Walton to outline a method of incorporating Tony's Parking Lot into the ski area permit. Memos outlining that plan flowed from Denver to Washington, to McGuire, to Ashworth emphasizing "Secretary Callaway's interest in this matter."

Top Forest Service and Agriculture Dept. officials were thus involved in a minor local Forest Service decision affecting a small ski area in a remote part of Colorado. The same pattern recurred in 1975 when the issue was expansion of the ski area to an adjacent mountain. Forest Service witnesses before the subcommittee termed such high-level involvement in an agency field decision unique in their experience. What set Crested Butte apart from others similarly situated? Only Mr. Callaway's ownership.

Harper's magazine seems to find this conduct above reproach, Mr. FitzPatrick agrees. I disagree. The subcommittee disagreed. I am confident that people who understand the very simple issue involved also disagree.

## SPECIALTY STEEL: AN INDUSTRY AT A CROSSROADS

## HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the situation surrounding import limitations on specialty steels, generally known as stainless steels, high speed, and tool steels, high temperature alloys, and electrical, magnetic, electronic, and refractory metals.

In the 15 years since 1960, imports of specialty steels have increased 835 percent, a major factor causing unemployment in the domestic specialty steel industry to rise as high as 40 percent. On January 16, 1977, the U.S. International Trade Commission determined that the imports were a "substantial cause of serious injury" to the domestic specialty steel industry. The Commission found that quantitative limitations for a 5-year period were "necessary to prevent or remedy such injury."

Relying upon the Commission's findings, the President negotiated a marketing agreement with Japan and imposed quantitative restrictions for a 3-year period, beginning June 14, 1976, on the other foreign countries that refused to negotiate.

After being in effect for only 14 months, the import limitations are just beginning to prove effective and production and employment in the specialty steel industry are increasing. More importantly, management has made major capital investment decisions with the belief that the market would be temporarily stabilized. However, in May of this year, President Carter announced plans to review the specialty steel import restraints with the option of continuing, reducing, or totally eliminating the limitations now in effect.

It is my firm belief that the removal or reduction of the import restraints at this early stage would undermine the entire recovery process and counter whatever gains have been made. The jobs of more than 65,000 workers, 15,000 of whom are iron ore miners in my district, will be in jeopardy and full recovery will remain uncertain unless import relief is continued. Perhaps most crucial to long-term recovery, modification of the import restraints would cause management to seriously reevaluate its major capital investment commitments so important to the future of the industry.

Specialty steel is an essential industry, critical not only to the production of aircraft, automobiles, oil refining equipment, and communication devices, but also in the fabrication of the major portion of our defense weapon system. We cannot, therefore, let foreign imports erode and weaken our domestic industry.

Even though 14 months of import restraints have helped, domestic specialty steel production in 1976 was approximately 20 percent below the total for 1974, employing 14 percent fewer people. Moreover, capacity utilization in 1976 re-

mained very low with no product line exceeding a 64 percent utilization rate. This contrasts with an 80 percent capacity utilization registered for U.S. manufacturing in general. Similarly the net operating profits as a percent of sales before taxes for the specialty steel industry was less than half of that registered for all U.S. manufacturing in general. Clearly then, the industry is still a long way from full recovery and merits the continuation of the import restraints.

I would like to point out that the disruptive market penetration of imports has not occurred because foreign specialty steel is a superior product. On the contrary, according to the ITC the United States has long been a leader in developing new processes of specialty steel and many of the processes currently being used throughout the world are the result of research in the United States. The U.S. steel industry is forced to compete with companies that are actively supported and/or subsidized by their governments and forced to compete with companies that use predatory pricing practices to acquire market shares. In addition, Japan maintains a virtual embargo on imports of specialty steel in their home market and the Europeans have agreements limiting Japanese imports to their countries.

I am confident that the continuation of our import limitations will give our specialty steel industry an opportunity to compete with these foreign countries. My belief in the strength of the American steel industry was reaffirmed when the specialty steel quotas were imposed in June 1976, resulting in increased domestic production without price increases. According to the ITC, "... domestic producers augmented their profits by increasing output, and thus achieving economies of scale, rather than by raising prices."

In light of all these facts, I urge the administration to continue the 3-year import restraints on specialty steel initiated in 1976 in order to give the American specialty steel industry a chance to recover from foreign assault, stabilize itself, and, thereby, become competitive again.

#### SUPPORT AMERICAN SPECIALTY STEELWORKERS

**HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the American specialty steelworker and industry is again under attack. American specialty steel has been hard hit by imports. Last year, the International Trade Commission recommended restrictions placed on these imports. Then President Ford placed restrictions on certain imports.

Now President Carter is reviewing the specialty steel import restraint program. The International Trade Commission is holding hearings on this subject.

Removal of these restraints would be

a mistake. I am submitting a statement to the International Trade Commission and contracting the President to express my opposition.

In 1975, I first contacted the International Trade Commission, urging import restrictions to guarantee American specialty steelworkers a fair shake. After the ITC made its recommendations I contacted President Ford on a number of occasions urging his support of the ITC's proposals. President Ford did announce import limitations on certain specialty steels and negotiated an agreement with Japan to set quantitative limits for a 3-year period.

The limitations have begun to have some impact and now President Carter is reviewing them. The restrictions should be left in place. Any removal of them would harm American workers. As I have stated before, basic American interests need protecting and one of the most basic is jobs.

Before limitations were placed on imports, the American specialty steel industry was being hard hit by what I consider unfair foreign competition. Now the limitations are beginning to have some impact and President Carter is having them reviewed. The limitations should be allowed to run their course.

Earlier in the year, the specialty steel industry was hit by a ban on Rhodesian chrome that was supported by the Carter administration. I opposed and voted against banning Rhodesian chrome which is used in the specialty steel industry. Prohibiting importation of Rhodesian chrome increases our reliance on Soviet chrome at higher prices. The American specialty steel industry cannot afford higher costs.

Foreign specialty steel makers have been subsidized directly or indirectly by their own governments while the U.S. Government has given little protection to our own industry. The result has been more imports and less American jobs. The Carter administration should give the present limitations a fair chance to work and not cave in to foreign pressure.

#### ROYAL NAVY TRAINING FOR YUGOSLAWS

**HON. LARRY McDONALD**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, Communist dictator Tito has been able to have the best of both the Communist and non-Communist worlds due to Western stupidity and the love of American policymakers for the so-called Third World that Tito is supposed to represent. However, whether the issue is Vietnam, the revolt in Hungary of 1956, or war in the Middle East, Tito has always helped the Communist world to the detriment of the West. Going along with artful game, it was interesting to learn that British are now permitting two Yugoslav

naval officers to attend the staff course at the Royal Naval College, in Greenwich, England. The article from the London Daily Telegraph of August 14, 1977, follows:

#### R.N. TRAINING FOR YUGOSLAWS

(By Desmond Wettern)

Naval officers from a Communist country are, for the first time, undergoing training with the Royal Navy in Britain.

A Yugoslav Commander and a Lieutenant Commander are just completing six months on the Staff Course at the Royal Naval College, Greenwich.

I understand that the invitation was made to Yugoslavia at the urging of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office.

Although officers on the course do not normally have access to classified material their presence would have had to have been drawn to the attention of the several defence establishments and factories and shipyards producing defence equipment which students visit during their course.

#### SYMPATHETIC TO BRITAIN

The purpose behind their visit is probably to help build up a nucleus of officers in the Yugoslav armed forces who could be expected in the future to have an understanding of and to be sympathetic towards Britain.

The possibility of severe pressure from Moscow for Yugoslavia to join the Warsaw Pact after the death of President Tito has long been a source of concern to Whitehall and Washington who have been keeping a close watch on Russian support for Croatian separatist movements anxious to end Slav domination of Yugoslav politics.

#### IMPORTS STILL RISING—POSE THREAT TO U.S. INDUSTRIES AND JOBS OF AMERICAN WORKERS

**HON. JOSHUA EILBERG**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, in recent months I have repeatedly spoken out on the international economic policies of this administration, which, like its predecessor, has shown undue favoritism to foreign producers of goods.

This favoritism continues to work to the extreme disadvantage of American industry and to the workers which American firms employ. At a time when unemployment in the United States remains stuck close to the 7 percent mark—with millions of workers unable to find employment—it is incredible to me that the administration would continue to permit expansion of foreign imports.

An ominous report on the continued growth of textile imports appeared in the August 22, 1977, issue of Southern Textile News, the newsweekly serving the textile industry. According to this report, these imports will grow at a pace that will be more than double the growth rate of the domestic industry. Inevitably, this continued acceleration of imports will further depress the domestic industry, inhibit its growth, and destroy job opportunities for thousands of American workers.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the earnest



attention of my colleagues the full text of the Southern Textile News article which follows:

#### IMPORTS EXPECTED TO CONTINUE RISING

CHARLOTTE, N.C.—Textile imports into the U.S. will apparently be increasing, not dropping, during the years ahead.

The growth rate during the next four years will be 6 percent a year, trade sources say. This expansion is permitted under terms of the Multi-Fiber Arrangement (MFA) which expires on Dec. 15 of this year but which is being extended for a period of four more years. The negotiations have been completed but the pact has not been signed.

The U.S. textile industry had hoped to limit growth to 2.5 percent, said Rick Utley, southeastern manager of public relations for the American Textile Manufacturers Institute (ATMI).

"We asked that the growth rate be no more than the growth rate of the domestic industry (2.5 per cent) over the last 11 years," he said. But government trade negotiators decided that a more reasonable goal would be the renewal of the present MFA, which allows for 6 per cent annual growth in imports.

The MFA is an international pact on bilateral agreements negotiated under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. In addition to this pact, the U.S. has 18 bilateral pacts with textile-producing nations. Eleven of the bilateral pacts also expire this year.

Some American textile executives say that the foreign countries, particularly Hong Kong and South Korea, pay low wages in the mills and ship most of their low-priced goods to the United States, depressing the market here.

The trade pacts give some protection to the U.S. textile industry, since quotas are set limiting how much yarn and apparel can be shipped to this country.

But each year the limits increase and the volume of imports rises.

In the U.S., apparel and textile imports rose almost 40 per cent last year alone, equal to more than one-third of the U.S. trade deficit. The penetration varies; more sweaters came into the U.S. last year than the total number of sweaters made in this country, but the import rate was low for fashion items.

However, the style-oriented portions of the apparel market account for much less volume than the commodity-oriented segments where imports have had their greatest effect.

Negotiations began in June in Geneva to renew the MFA, but broke down in July although the U.S., Japan and the major less-developed countries were favorable to extension of the agreement.

"The majority of the European Community countries feel that way, too, but the French and British were adamant about changes or some special considerations for European countries," said Ellis Meredith, an official of the American Apparel Manufacturers Association.

Michael B. Smith, chief U.S. textile negotiator, presented a protocol on renewal of the MFA which will allow for departures from the agreement in cases where the impact of foreign goods on a domestic industry is severe.

This flexibility means that bilateral agreements can be reached between nations providing for lower growth rates for some kinds of imports and higher rates for others, so long as overall growth averages out to 6 per cent a year.

But Meredith notes: "That doesn't thrill us a bit, since we have no interest in helping one part of the industry at the expense of another sector."

## NATIONAL ENERGY ACT

### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for August 10, 1977, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

#### NATIONAL ENERGY ACT

The Congress has struggled with the energy crisis since the Arab oil embargo in 1973-1974. It has considered hundreds of energy bills, enacted several of them, and rejected many. Historically, the problem for the Congress has been that although the people apparently want the President and the Congress to enact a comprehensive energy program, they are against many of the crucial proposals in any energy package.

Tackling the energy crisis once again, the Congress just approved a bill creating a Department of Energy, and the House of Representatives approved the National Energy Act, the most important energy legislation yet considered by the Congress. The National Energy Act has three principal objectives: energy conservation, conversion to coal, and increased production. Its goals are to be accomplished primarily by raising the price of energy, especially the price of oil and gas, in order to reduce demand and to increase the competitive attractiveness of coal. It establishes six goals to be achieved by 1985: 1. Reducing the average growth rate of energy consumption to 2 percent each year; 2. Reducing oil imports to less than 6 million barrels a day (imports now are 9 million barrels a day); 3. Achieving a 10 percent reduction in gasoline consumption from the 1977 level; 4. Retrofitting for energy conservation 90 percent of residential and commercial buildings in the United States; 5. Increasing coal production by at least 400 million tons each year over 1976 levels and; 6. Using solar energy in more than 2½ million homes.

To achieve these goals, the National Energy Act provides for:

1. Conservation in Buildings: tax credits, loans and grants for energy conservation programs for existing residential and commercial buildings.

2. Crude Oil Tax: a tax on crude oil to raise the price over a three-year period to the world price of oil. Taxpayers and adult nontaxpayers would receive rebates of the tax.

3. Natural Gas Pricing: a single uniform price policy for natural gas produced in the United States with an incentive price of \$1.75 per million BTU's.

4. Business Taxes and Credits: a use tax on business consumption of oil or natural gas to discourage consumption and an additional 10 percent investment tax credit for investment in equipment for conservation and conversion to other fuels.

5. Public Utility Regulatory Policy: A method to move electric utilities toward pricing electricity at the cost of providing service to each class of consumer so as to encourage conservation.

6. Other Provisions: tax incentives for geothermal, gas and oil drilling ventures and mandatory efficiency standards for appliances.

This bill seeks to deal with the fundamental problem of energy policy: the insecurity of U.S. oil supply. Each day the United States is moving toward an increasingly perilous position in regard to the adequacy and the reliability of its energy supply. In 1973-74 oil prices quadrupled, and the United States produced \$375 billion less than potential

output in the 1974-1976 period. Last year the United States spent \$32 billion for imported oil and this year we are running about 50 percent above the same period for last year. The United States now imports almost 50 percent of its oil supplies, up from 23 percent in 1970. As these statistics show, it is vital to decrease significantly U.S. vulnerability to a change in the international oil market, and that is what this bill seeks to do.

Nobody knows the precise impact of the National Energy Act, but it is estimated that it will reduce imports by between 2.6 million and 2.9 million barrels a day in 1985. It will have a measurable, but modest, inflationary impact, estimated to increase the price level from 0.3 to 0.4 percent. The taxes raised by the bill will largely be returned to the taxpayer through reduced withholding of federal taxes, thus substantially restoring the purchasing power. The average taxpayer will be given enough added take-home pay to cover his higher energy prices.

The action of the House this week will probably only enforce existing trends toward energy conservation, higher oil and gas prices and conversion to coal. These trends may outpace the goals of the energy program. Energy intensive industries are forecasting energy savings of 15-20 percent, the automobile industry is ahead of schedule in realizing the mandated goals for achieving better miles per gallon, and coal supply is increasing.

I am not satisfied with every provision of this bill. I supported additional production incentives, which were not approved, and I opposed the additional gasoline tax, which was deleted from the bill. I voted for the bill on final passage, however, because I believe it is essential that we put into place a comprehensive energy policy. It is easy to criticize certain provisions, and to persuade ourselves that one provision or another is unnecessary or unwise. The bill may not be all it is touted to be, but it is an initial step toward what must be a disciplined effort by Americans to cut down the use of fuel. My guess is that other, and even less popular steps will be necessary.

## MEXICAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

### HON. DALE F. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, this September 16 our great neighbor Mexico will celebrate its 167th anniversary of independence. It is appropriate on this occasion to extend on behalf of the American people our sincere congratulations to the people of Mexico. The growing and prosperous democracy of Mexico has contributed much to our great heritage. Mexican Americans have lived in the United States for more than 350 years, as exemplified by Santa Fe, N. Mex. established in 1598.

Throughout our country, the Independence Day of Mexico is celebrated by many Mexican-American communities. Traditionally these celebrations serve as excellent opportunities to examine the rich cultural, social and economic contributions of Mexican Americans and all Americans of Spanish speaking heritage.

I am proud to share with you that on September 11, 1977, in cooperation with the city of Flint, the Mexican flag will

be raised and flown over Flint City Hall. This event, sponsored by the Spanish Speaking Information Center of Flint, commemorates Mexican Independence Day. It serves as an opportunity to re-examine the overall status of our Spanish-speaking peoples. And it provides a focus in which to better understand contributions of Mexican Americans.

I would therefore ask that the House of Representatives join me in congratulating the Spanish Speaking Information Center of Flint, Mich. and all people participating in the celebration of Mexican Independence Day.

#### HUMPHREY ON LIVING

### HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, during the recess I paid a brief hospital visit to Senator HUMPHREY and was struck again by how rich his life is—even with cancer. And by how much his current illness is helping many learn more about living.

We in Minnesota have great respect and a deep love for our senior Senator. And it has often been during times of difficulty in his life that he has lifted the spirits of others by his example and tremendous attitude.

Someone shared with me an article in the August issue of the Reader's Digest by the Senator on how he is dealing personally with his illness. Senator HUMPHREY knows how to live. All of us can gain something very profound through his words.

Our people should be grateful for a man such as this.

The article follows:

**"YOU CAN'T QUIT"—THE DISTINGUISHED SENATOR FROM MINNESOTA TELLS HOW HE HAS COPEL WITH CANCER—AND LIVES LIFE TO THE FULLEST**

(By HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

The worst moment in my life was when I discovered that I had cancer. I know what this dread disease can do to a person and what the chances for survival are. But if you think of yourself as a statistic, then you're really in trouble. You have to believe that somehow you can win this fight. You have to gear yourself to the continuity of the struggle, knowing that there will be days when you won't feel too good.

My faith and hope get me from day to day. A favorite verse in the Bible is from St. Matthew: "If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place, and it shall remove; and nothing shall be impossible unto you." Deep down, I believe in miracles. They have happened to a lot of people who were given up to die and then were restored to health.

But there are days when I get discouraged. I look at myself in the mirror and say, "Humphrey, you look like a sad sack." Because of the chemotherapy, I've lost a lot of hair, and got much thinner. My trousers don't fit; my shirt collar is the wrong size. When I start feeling sorry for myself, I tell myself: "The doctors told you this would happen. You can't do anything about it, so get on with living." Then I go and have my clothes altered.

#### THE WILL TO HANG ON

If you don't overcome self-pity, the game's all over. My father taught us there was no time for self-pity in life. You had work to do. On the plains of South Dakota, adversity was part of daily life. I remember the dust storms, the blizzards, the summer heat and droughts. Yet when the crops failed, you always thought, There's another year coming. I'll prepare the soil and pray. You were always future-oriented.

My family lost a lot, especially during the Depression. One of my saddest memories is of my mother crying and my dad with tears in his eyes because they had to sell our home to pay the bills. But in life it isn't what you've lost, it's what you've got left that counts. We had a lot left. We had ourselves, our family, our store. It was only a question of time before things would get better. The important thing was who would be the survivors. Who had the will to hang on for a better day.

I think the biggest mistake people make is giving up. Adversity is an experience, not a final act. Some people look upon any setback as the end. They're always looking for the benediction rather than the invocation. Most of us have enough problems so that almost any day we could fold up and say, "I've had it." But you can't quit. That isn't the way our country was built.

Life's always a struggle. If anything's easy, it's not likely to be worthwhile. I made up my mind very early that I would have to improve myself. I went back to the University of Minnesota after a six-year absence and, let me tell you, it wasn't easy. My wife, Muriel, had a job, earning something like \$45 a month. She used to make sandwiches that we could sell to earn extra money. I was carrying a heavy academic load, but I worked six hours every night in a neighborhood drugstore. I never felt I couldn't make it.

One of my hardest battles was running for the Presidency in 1968. I had been given the chance I dreamed about, to be the standard-bearer of my party, but there were moments when we were so far behind that I got discouraged. Our party was broke. I remember saying to Muriel, "If we can't afford an airplane, we'll get in a car or a bus because, damn it, we're not going to give up, we're not going to quit."

To come as close as we finally did to winning the highest office in this land and then to lose it was hard. But in writing my concession speech, I told myself, "This has to be done right because it is the opening speech of your next campaign!" I was already looking ahead.

I've often thought of how we could have handled things differently. But I don't have any bitterness. Bitterness takes too much energy and accomplishes nothing. It doesn't hurt the other person. You think you're sending out the rays of bitterness like laser beams, but they stay inside of you—consuming you. As Lyndon Johnson often said, you can tell a fellow to go to hell, but it's hard to make him go.

#### SOURCES OF STRENGTH

The important thing in any setback is whether you can pick yourself up. That helps me with my illness. I keep thinking, "Well, tomorrow is another day." There may be people who'll say, "It's all right for you to talk about tomorrow being another day, but if you knew how much pain I suffer . . ." I do know. When I had to take X-ray treatments, I used to get up in the middle of the night with bladder spasms. One time I was in such agony that I honestly wanted to give it all up. But even in the deepest despair you have to look up—keep your eyes on the mountaintop. I believe, I know, that a positive outlook can influence your physical well-being, that it can help you fight something like cancer. If you have the will to live, it

can help the process of recovery. Medical experience has supported this.

But I feel, also, that not all of my life is in my own hands. There is a power beyond man—Divine Providence, the will of God. It is a powerful source of strength if you can get in tune with it. Like anybody else's my faith is sometimes rocked. When I'm feeling low, I draw strength from the prayer of St. Francis of Assisi. Part of it says, "Where there is doubt, let me sow faith; where there is despair, hope; where there is darkness, light; and where there is sadness, joy." I think it is the perfect prayer.

One of the greatest sources of strength throughout my illness has been my family, especially Muriel. We've been married more than 40 years, and she's put up with an awful lot from me. When I found out I had to have surgery, we decided to tell the children in a family gathering. Muriel fixed a brunch at our home in Waverly, Minnesota, and they all came. Then I called them to attention and told them: "You've just got to have faith with me that this is going to come out all right. Because if you doubt whether I'm going to make it, that's ten points off my chance."

I would be dishonest if I didn't say that there were some bad moments. At one point, when I was in the hospital, Muriel said, "Last night I was so angry that I cried. I keep asking, why you?" I told her I had felt that way, too. I don't know the answer. Looks like I always win the little elections and lose the big ones. But it is me, so why spend time trying to figure out why?

During those inevitable periods of depression and anger, another thing that kept me going was the great outpouring of love in telegrams, cards and letters from all over the world. I tell you they had a real healing effect on me. The greatest gift that has come to me is the affection of so many—far more important than people feeling sorry for me. In fact, feeling sorry for someone is simply to give him a little pain reliever. Love is a healing force.

When I was in the hospital, people marveled that I was up so quickly, visiting other patients. Can you imagine Hubert Humphrey strapped to a hospital bed? By the third day after surgery, I was walking around saying hello to people I knew were in worse shape than I was. I was doing it for them and for me.

Let me tell you something. What you give, you receive back a thousandfold. After World War II, this country was magnanimous and magnificent. We shared with all and the more we gave, the more we had. If you have a well and draw water from it, it fills. If you don't draw water, it gets stagnant. You have to learn to give yourself

#### LIFE TO THE FULLEST

One reason I can keep going is that I enjoy living. I have a great inquisitiveness about the future. I see so many people younger than I who have no interest in tomorrow. But I want to live to the year 2000, to be around to see what's going to happen.

When you're older, you're bound to think about how many more days or years you have left. It certainly goes through my mind. Then I think, well, Humphrey, there's not much you can do about that, is there? Except live life to the fullest.

I must say it doesn't help when someone comes up and says, "Gee, you look bad." Back in January when the Senate opened for the new session, I had just had major surgery. Then I got the flu. I looked and felt pretty bad. But I came for the opening of the Senate because I was in the contest for Majority Leader.

Well, seems that day every camera in the United States was focused on me. The press kept running those pictures, and they stressed how drawn and haggard I looked. I said to one reporter, "Don't bury me prematurely. I'm apt to get right out of the coffin."



Anyone who has experienced what I have knows damn well how bad he looks. I got so tired of hearing people talk about it that Muriel and I went to the Virgin Islands to rest and relax. When I got back, looking better, I thought, "Take my picture now."

It helps in life to have a sense of humor. If not, you start taking yourself too seriously and lose perspective. While in the Virgin Islands, I liked to tell my friends, "What a wonderful place this is! They've got Greta Garbo down here who doesn't talk to anybody and Hubert Humphrey who'll talk to everybody."

I hope I can demonstrate for others that you don't have to throw in the towel when you have something like cancer. Be grateful for every day of life. Be buoyant with it and do the best you can with what you have.

My goodness, there are people who live their lives with physical defects—doing marvelous things. Ray Charles is blind and he's one of our great musicians. Look at Max Cleland who is a dynamic director of the Veterans Administration. He came from Vietnam minus two legs and a right arm. Franklin Roosevelt was crippled by polio and needed steel braces to stand; but the pain never showed on his face as he conveyed to the nation his message of confidence and moving "forward with a strong and active faith."

A month after my surgery, I went back to work. There's nothing worse for a person with something like cancer than to have nothing to do. If a person can't work, there are other things to do. It's important to be involved with people and activities.

My staff tells me I ought to cut down on my schedule. There are days when I wonder if I'm really making the best use of my time. But I enjoy being a Senator. When I'm in committee meetings, handling foreign affairs, economic and social problems, agriculture issues, I feel that I'm a part of the life of this country. I feel vital.

The day after I withdrew from the Majority Leader race last January, my colleagues made me "Deputy President Pro Tempore of the Senate." It provided me with such things as extra salary and a special office. But far more important, I would be included in the Senate leadership meetings at the White House. It showed that my colleagues recognized that I had given a lifetime of service to my party and that I still had more to give. They bestowed a great honor on me. They also gave me something more to live for.

I'm sure many people think my odds against cancer are not very good. But it's a race I'm in, and I can't get off the pony. I've got to ride it and hope that I'm going to win. How long should a person live? I don't know. What's more important is how you live and what you live for. As long as I have a breath of life I'm going to try to live actively and be a part of the daily life of my family and friends, my job, neighborhood, community and country. I'm not changing my life because I have had cancer. With the help of the good Lord, my wife and family, the love and affection of so many friends, the care of my doctors, and my own love of life, I expect to be around for quite a while.

#### CHANGE IN SECURITY EXCHANGE ACT

**HON. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR.**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to make a small but important

change in the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. This legislation would delay for 2 years the effective date of a section of that law which prohibits stock brokerage firms which manage money from also effecting brokerage transactions for those managed accounts.

This prohibition was included in the Securities Acts Amendments of 1975. Much has happened since the passage of that legislation—most importantly, an end to fixed commission rates—and the prohibition contained in section 11(a) of the Securities Exchange Act may no longer be appropriate.

It seems prudent, then, to delay the effective date of the prohibition to allow additional experience with the changing market systems before determining whether section 11(a) should be amended, repealed, or allowed to take effect. My bill, therefore, simply changes the effective date of that prohibition from May 1, 1978, to May 1, 1980.

#### POWERLINE TRAGEDY SHOWS VALUE OF CPR TRAINING

**HON. WILLIAM D. FORD**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we frequently discuss the need for more widespread training of safety officers in modern cardiopulmonary resuscitation, but rarely do we see, first hand, the value of such training.

During the August recess, I had the experience of seeing just how important such "CPR" training can be; how it can literally mean the difference between life and death.

On August 6, my constituents celebrated my birthday, as they have for the past 13 years, with a huge picnic in my honor. Some 6,000 persons were in attendance.

One of the highlights was a demonstration of cable-controlled model-airplanes flying over the park. Tragedy struck when one of the planes snagged on a power line. Within seconds, three men were lying on the ground—victims of electrical shock.

Stationed nearby, was a police officer, Cpl. Donald Woods, a member of the Taylor Police Department, whose members have all had CPR training.

Corporal Woods rushed to the scene, and immediately applied cardiopulmonary resuscitation to one of the victims, who was unconscious and had stopped breathing. The officer revived the man, and moved on to the other two stricken men, to whom he also applied CPR tactics.

Meanwhile, the first victim had again lapsed into unconsciousness, Corporal Woods rushed back, again restored him, and then ordered him sent to a hospital, where, tragically, he died a short time later. The other two victims, under Corporal Woods' skilled CPR work, recovered completely.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot too highly praise Corporal Woods, and the Taylor Police

Department, headed by Chief Raymond Quiel, who had the foresight to insist on CPR training for his entire department.

Too often, Mr. Speaker, we take for granted the knowledge and training of our dedicated public safety officers.

I am pleased to bring this story to the attention of our colleagues, and to publicly thank Cpl. Donald Woods. It was a tragedy which might have been much worse but for his quick and skillful use of his CPR training.

#### 1977 LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

**HON. MORRIS K. UDALL**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to place in the Record the results of my 1977 legislative questionnaire.

Nearly 18,000 constituents from the Second Congressional District of Arizona took the time to respond and many included their own well-thought-out and informative comments.

I am pleased and flattered that my constituents care enough about the issues of the day to inform their Congressman of their views.

The questionnaire results follow:

#### 1977 LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE

Below are several questions followed by a series of statements. For each question, please check the blank space following the statement which most nearly expresses your opinion. You'll notice that I have provided three answer spaces beside each statement so that three members of your household may respond to this survey. If none of the statements expresses your view, please feel free to write me separately.

1. In 1972, Congress approved a proposed constitutional amendment (the Equal Rights Amendment—ERA) that says, "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex." To date, 35 state legislatures have ratified the amendment. Three more states must approve it before it can become part of the Constitution. I feel that:

a. The ERA should become part of the Constitution, 54 percent.

b. The ERA should not become part of the Constitution, 40 percent.

c. Other or undecided, 6 percent.

2. The Supreme Court has ruled that abortion in the first six months of pregnancy is a private decision for the woman and her doctor. My opinion on this is:

a. Abortion is morally wrong, and should be prohibited in all but life-or-death cases, 28 percent.

b. I agree with the Court that abortion is a private matter, to be decided by the woman and her doctor, 69 percent.

c. Other or undecided, 3 percent.

3. In most places, simple possession of marijuana is a serious crime, punishable by jail terms or heavy fines. My view is that:

a. Marijuana is a dangerous drug whose use should be controlled, and so I favor keeping the criminal penalties as they are, 38 percent.

b. No harmful effects have been shown from marijuana use. I feel it should be "decriminalized"—possession of small amounts for personal use should be treated as a minor

civil offense similar to a traffic violation, 51 percent.

c. Other or undecided, 11 percent.

4. Large oil and gas companies own wells, refineries, and gas stations. Recently they have been expanding their operations into other fuels such as uranium and coal.

a. I feel that if oil companies are allowed to buy up coal and mineral reserves, we will see the same price fixing and excessive profit-making we now have with oil. They should not be allowed to expand in this way, 56 percent.

b. Oil companies have the capital and expertise our country needs to develop alternate sources. They should be permitted to expand into any of the other energy sources, 34 percent.

c. Other or undecided, 10 percent.

5. President Carter has proposed that we place a "gas guzzler" tax on cars that get poor mileage and then rebate that money to buyers of cars with good gas mileage. I feel that:

a. This is a good way to encourage energy conservation because it does not force anyone to do what they don't want, but instead provides a strong incentive to buy cars which save gas, 31 percent.

b. I don't think this would be effective because people who can afford to buy and drive "gas guzzlers" can also afford to pay the extra tax. We should instead limit the number of cars getting low gas mileage which auto manufacturers may produce, 53 percent.

c. Other or undecided, 16 percent.

6. The Central Arizona Project (CAP) is a \$1.6 billion proposal to bring Colorado River water to the Phoenix and Tucson areas, with 80 percent of the costs to be repaid through water rates and property taxes. Congress has spent \$390 million so far, and 20 percent of the Project has been built. My feeling is:

a. CAP should be completed, 61 percent.

b. CAP is an expensive mistake and should be terminated, 23 percent.

c. Other or undecided, 16 percent.

7. Nuclear energy now generates about 10 percent of all U.S. electricity. More plants are being proposed and built, and some people are opposed to these additional plants.

a. I feel that there are serious problems of cost, energy, safety, and reliability of nuclear plants, and problems with the disposal of long-lived radioactive wastes. We should stop building new plants and phase out existing ones, 17 percent.

b. We have had nuclear plants for 15 years with no major accidents. They are reasonably safe and cleaner than coal. I feel we should build more or the economy will suffer, 41 percent.

c. I feel we need to "go slow" on building more nuclear plants until we find ways to ensure safety at existing plants, even if this adds to the cost of new plants, 38 percent.

d. Other or undecided, 4 percent.

8. This year's defense budget is \$112 billion and represents about 25 percent of our total Federal spending. I feel that:

a. We are wasting money which could be better spent improving the welfare, health, and education level of our people. We could cut defense spending by \$5 to \$10 billion and still have a strong defense, 37 percent.

b. The U.S. is presently keeping up with the Soviet arms buildup, and for our continued security we need to keep the defense budget at its current level, 29 percent.

c. We are underestimating the defense needs of the U.S. in the face of a major arms buildup by the Soviet Union, and we need to spend more, 27 percent.

d. Other or undecided, 7 percent.

9. In 1976, much of the cost of electing a President was paid for by a new system financed by people who "checked off" \$1 on their income tax returns for this purpose. Some say that this is a good system which worked well and it should also be used to pay part of the cost of elections for the House or Senate. I think that:

a. Public financing promotes honest elections and diminishes the role of special interest groups. I think it should be extended to Congressional general elections, 59 percent.

b. People should not be asked to finance private political campaigns with public money, 31 percent.

c. Other or undecided, 10 percent.

10. Currently, our government regulates prices on domestic oil and gas. Because of this regulation, domestic oil and gas prices have risen less steeply in the past several years than has the price of foreign oil. There is lively debate in Congress this year over whether oil and gas price controls should be removed, I believe:

a. We should "deregulate" and do away with all these controls so that oil companies will have increased earnings to develop vital energy resources, 23 percent.

b. Because the large oil companies form a monopoly, there really is no free market in petroleum products. We need to protect consumers by regulating oil and gas prices. Prices have already risen more than fourfold in recent years, providing plenty of incentive as well as profits, 70 percent.

c. Other or undecided, 7 percent.

# THE LIGHT WATER BREEDER REACTOR: A NAVAL REACTOR MEANS CIVILIAN ENERGY

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, September 2, the Science and Technology Committee was informed that a small prototype reactor with a thorium breeding blanket became operational for the first time in Shippingport, Pa. Without fanfare, the operation of the first light water breeder reactor marks another milestone in the Naval Reactor Development program of the Energy Research and Development Administration. More than 20 years ago, this program was responsible for the timely development of the type of light water reactor which is the foundation of our current nuclear power industry.

Today, when it has become critical to conserve our nuclear fuel resources, this program has advanced nuclear power generation in the civilian sector by providing a reactor that is a much more efficient user of nuclear fuel. Though it is not a true breeder—it does not produce more fuel than it uses—it may open up the world's thorium reserves as a source of nuclear fuel.

It is, of course, only a first tentative step—no steam has been generated, no electrical power has been put on the local grid. The most important lesson to be learned from the operation of the light water breeder is the continuing creativity of ERDA's Naval Reactor Development program for civilian applications.

The program is a paramount example of the positive interaction between civilian and military programs in the ERDA. This result is possible because the program has always had a unified management in ERDA with the civilian applications closely tied to the development of naval reactors. Within Congress, the program has historically been seen as a re-

search and development effort. This means that most of the work is, in large part, independent of its applications. To split the effort, either in ERDA or in Congress, would be to destroy the very synergism and creativity which has made it so successful. Admiral Rickover and his staff and the many devoted workers are to be commended for their continued outstanding work.

## AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION AND GRAND JURIES

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the most recent position the American Bar Association has adopted on the grand jury system.

The Washington Post editorial was published a month—August 10, 1977—after my own appraisal of the system appeared in the Boston Globe—July 11, 1977. I find it amazing how much in agreement I am with this organization. It is even more amazing how much in agreement they are with me.

The articles follow:

[From the Boston Globe, July 11, 1977]

GRAND JURIES: IT'S TIME TO REFORM OR ABOLISH THEM

(By William Clay)

If grand juries are not abolished, they ought to be altered to curtail the prosecutorial abuses inherent in the present system. The original intent of the grand jury was to protect the innocent who had been accused falsely. It supposedly was conceived as a group of peers deliberating in secrecy to determine if sufficient evidence existed to bring criminal charges against a neighbor.

The idea was transported to this country from England and developed as an intricate and prudent body of law to balance the interest of individual freedom with the interest of the state in protecting society against criminals.

However, in recent years grand juries have been composed almost exclusively of society's elite. The interest of the individual has been totally disregarded as prosecutors use the juries as a personal tool to harass, intimidate and frame those who espouse radical causes or differing political opinions.

Citizens who are targets of grand jury investigations, or more precisely the targets of prosecutors, are denied "due process" of law and most assuredly are not guaranteed the secrecy of the proceedings. In fact, most prosecutors have arrangements with the media to leak derogatory, unsubstantiated testimony to discredit and destroy the accused. In addition, the accused is not permitted legal counsel while appearing before the grand jury, not afforded the basic right to be confronted by his accusers nor is he allowed to cross-examine.

The argument that the proceedings are not adversary is groundless. In this age of "Kojak", investigative reporters hell bent on over-dramatizing, over-exploiting, over-sensationalizing every accusation of crime, a grand jury indictment becomes synonymous with guilt. In my opinion, the present system constitutes a blatant disregard of rights of the individual. Most grand jurors are pawns in the hands of many unscrupulous



prosecutors who select what evidence will be considered, which witnesses will be called to testify, who will be granted immunity and which charges will be leveled.

Most indictments are written by the prosecutor independent of consultation with the jurors and then automatically signed by them. In effect, grand juries are no more than rubber stamps placing the onus of guilt on the accused.

There is a real need for the Congress to either reform the system drastically or abolish it. If evidence exists that indicates a person committed a crime, why not take that evidence before the court in a preliminary hearing and give the accused the right to cross-examine?

Why go through the sham, the charade of pretending to be judged by an impartial panel of one's peers? The only justification I see for the continued use of a grand jury would be in the most extreme cases dealing with fraud and other complex white-collar crimes where extensive documents and book-keeping, suspects, witnesses and lawyers make public presentations difficult and cumbersome; crimes alleged to have been committed by public officials or policemen; and cases where the protection of witnesses is essential or where some suspects are still at large.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 11, 1977]

#### HOW TO MAKE GRAND JURIES WORK

Legislation pending in Congress to change the rules under which federal grand juries operate got a helping hand Wednesday when the American Bar Association approved a set of principles for grand-jury reform. Chief among them is a recommendation that a witness be allowed to have a lawyer present when being questioned in the grand-jury room. This recommendation, if accepted by Congress—and we hope it will be—should go a long way toward eliminating the abuses by prosecutors that have made the grand-jury system suspect. In doing so, it may save the grand jury from extinction.

Originally created in England as a mechanism for protecting citizens against an overbearing government, the grand jury has been used instead by many prosecutors as an instrument for harassing witnesses and browbeating defendants before they are indicted. The Nixon administration was especially skillful at using grand juries for political rather than law-enforcement purposes.

While the Department of Justice has recognized the need for new rules to end such abuses, it is not prepared to go as far as the Bar Association in fundamental reform. Attorney General Griffin Bell, in fact, argued before the lawyers against giving witnesses the right to have a lawyer with them—at present, witnesses' lawyers are required to wait outside the grand-jury room. His fear, and that of many prosecutors, is that grand-jury proceedings will come to resemble those of a trial, thus making the task of law-enforcement officials even more formidable than it is now. We think such fear is exaggerated. But even if it were not, this basic change in the law would be needed to preserve the grand jury's intended function.

Grand juries have been much criticized in the past few decades. They were abolished in England in 1933 and have been eliminated in several states. Their life expectancy in the remaining states and in the federal system was not considered great a few years ago because of the ways in which the juries had been abused. But that has changed. The Watergate affair provided a striking example of their usefulness in investigating and bringing indictments in situations where no other technique could have enjoyed public confidence. They are worth saving—but only if they are restored to the function intended by the Bill of Rights. The best way to do

that would be for Congress to pass legislation along the lines suggested this week by the nation's lawyers.

#### PANAMA'S STORMY PAST

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, two of the United States' most capable diplomats, Ambassadors Ellsworth Bunker and Sol Linowitz, have concluded negotiations with representatives of the Republic of Panama resulting in long-overdue agreements designed to replace the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903.

Last evening heads of state and Cabinet Ministers from 23 other Western Hemisphere nations gathered at the Organization of American States to witness the signing of new treaties and, by their presence, to testify to their concurrence with and approval of the contents of these documents.

Within our own country at this time, however, there is little knowledge of the specific terms of the new accords, or of their implications for the future. Between now and the new year when the Senate will consider ratification of these documents, a truly informative and soul-searching debate will be in order.

This highly volatile issue, already the subject of much rhetoric and hair-pulling, may be the most important single issue to confront this Congress. The crucial impact of our decisions on future hemispheric relations cannot be overstated.

Yesterday's Washington Post carried a brief and objective article by Don Oberdorfer relating the history of our involvement in Panama. Members who are already committed to either side of the debate, as well as those who have not taken a firm stand, will find the following article helpful and informative:

A CANAL CHRONICLE—"HIGHWAY OF CIVILIZATION" HAS HAD A STORMY PAST

(By Don Oberdorfer)

The Panama Canal treaties to be signed tonight are the product of 13 years of U.S. Panamanian negotiations and 74 years of history.

For large numbers of Americans, the transfer of the canal to Panama is a puzzling "giveaway" of a major U.S. asset created by Yankee ingenuity, sweat and dollars.

But for Panamanians and many other Latin Americans, the new canal treaties are the long-delayed redress of a historic wrong and the end to an era of Yankee colonial domination.

"We bought it, we paid for it, we built it," declared former California Gov. Ronald Reagan in campaign oratory last year against the "giveaway" of the canal.

The historians say Reagan understated the case in one crucial respect: in order to arrange for the construction of the canal by the United States and its operation forever under favorable conditions, President Theodore Roosevelt virtually created the country of Panama in 1903 as a compliant negotiating partner.

Late in the 19th century a French company went broke trying to dig a canal be-

tween the Atlantic and Pacific oceans across the steamy jungle of Panama, which was then an obscure province of Colombia. About the turn of the century Roosevelt became interested in the project and pressed Colombia to sign a treaty allowing the United States to dig and operate a canal.

Colombia refused, but Roosevelt would not take no for an answer. Arguing that Colombian "jackrabbits" should not be permitted to bar "one of the future highways of civilization," Roosevelt encouraged the province to secede from Colombia and sent a U.S. gunboat and troops to make sure the "rebellion" succeeded.

On Nov. 18, 1903, two weeks after the secession, Washington signed a treaty with the infant "Republic of Panama" providing U.S. rights in perpetuity over a 10-mile zone bisecting the country as the site of the future canal. "I took the Canal Zone," Roosevelt later boasted, Secretary of State John Hay, who signed the treaty for the United States, called it "vastly advantageous to the United States and, we must confess, not so advantageous to Panama."

The clouded origin of the 1903 treaty and Canal Zone was little known to Americans, but the engineering and construction feat that followed stirred public pride. Costing \$387 million and the lives of 32,000 people—who died of malaria, yellow fever, other diseases and accidents—the building of the canal was a historic achievement.

"It was the moon shot of the day," former Canal Zone Gov. David S. Parker said recently.

Since the grand opening of the canal on Aug. 15, 1914, the 51-mile-long waterway has won a place in world commerce and military strategy. During World War II, 24 million tons of military supplies passed through, saving 8,000 miles and about 30 days over the Cape Horn route around South America. During the Vietnam war, about 70 per cent of the cargo for the war zone passed through the canal.

Today the largest U.S. aircraft carriers and supertankers are too big to navigate the canal, and its economic importance is declining. Only about 4 per cent of U.S. coast-to-coast trade uses the canal, less than half the proportion of a decade ago. The canal is considered by U.S. authorities to be militarily and economically important but not as vital as in the past.

Half a century after its creation, the Republic of Panama increasingly was imbued in the 1950s and 1960s with the nationalistic spirit that swept the rest of the "Third World." To this country of 1.7 million people and 29,200 square miles—almost the size of Maine—the U.S. operation of the canal and the Canal Zone under the 1903 treaty was a vestige of colonialism and a national indignity.

In 1964, mounting tensions erupted into riots over the issue of the flying of the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone. Four Americans and 20 Panamanians were killed and 80 other people injured. Panama broke diplomatic relations with the United States and took its case to the United Nations and the Organization of American States.

President Johnson, after consulting former Presidents Eisenhower and Truman in a bid for bipartisan support, agreed to renegotiate the 1903 treaty. Three draft treaties were agreed upon in 1967, but no action was taken toward ratification in either country due to their controversial nature.

The Panamanian government formally rejected the drafts in 1970 after Gen. Omar Torrijos took power in a bloodless coup with the canal as his major issue.

Talks resumed in 1971 but gained momentum only after the United States vetoed a U.N. Security Council resolution supporting Panama in 1973.

In 1974, Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger signed a "statement of understanding" for the Nixon administration, agreeing to principles for a new treaty of limited duration.

President Ford continued the negotiations but, faced with a right-wing challenge in the Republican Party and a tough race last year for election, he did not push for an early conclusion.

During the presidential campaign Jimmy Carter took a cautious position, favoring a treaty but saying he would not give up "practical control" of the canal.

After the election, Carter called the issue a "festering problem" for the United States in Latin America and instructed his negotiators to push full speed ahead to a new arrangement by June, 1977, if possible.

#### PHILADELPHIA TO SPEND \$1.5 MILLION BUILDING SEVEN SENIOR CITIZENS' FACILITIES

### HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the city of Philadelphia—the "City of Brotherly Love"—is also the city with an abiding concern for its senior citizens. These are the people whose hands helped build America, and Philadelphia is continuing its efforts to provide the good life for them in their retirement years.

Mayor Frank L. Rizzo has just announced that the department of recreation will construct seven senior citizens' facilities at its centers around the city, at a total cost of \$1.5 million.

Contracts totaling \$142,400 have already been awarded for the first of these centers at the East Germantown Recreation Center, Chelton Avenue and Ardleigh Street.

Other facilities exclusively for the goldenagers are slated for the Lower Mayfair playground, Battersby and Robbins; Mann Recreation Center, 5th Street and Allegheny Avenue; Ziehlner playground, B Street and Olney Avenue; Conshohocken and Windemere playground, King Recreation Center, 22d Street and Columbia Avenue and the playground at Bustleton and Solly Avenues. Contracts will be awarded in the future for these facilities.

"I have been concerned about the problems of our older citizens for a long time, and I am most gratified that we have been able to arrange for these facilities," Mayor Rizzo said.

The money for the construction originates from a special citizens section of the community development program.

The initial building at East Germantown will be a one-story brick structure containing a 1,000 square foot all-purpose room, a kitchenette, an arts and crafts room, a director's office and a utility room. All activities in the building will be designed for senior citizens.

Mayor Rizzo also announced that \$100,000 in contracts has been awarded under the senior citizens' program for the construction of a new bocce facility at Vine and Daggett Streets.

The court will be built on the stricken

Daggett Street which is adjacent to the Granahan playground (65th and Calowhill Streets) and Cobbs Creek Parkway. There is a large following of the sport of bocce in the area.

### CHINA—CAPTIVE NATION

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Captive Nations Week is celebrated with special spirit in the Republic of China, as the citizens there are ever mindful of their counterparts on the Chinese mainland who suffer so horrendously under a dictatorial regime.

On July 22, in Taipei, a rally was held in observance of Captive Nations Week. One of the featured speakers was our own distinguished colleague, Congressman WILLIAM L. DICKINSON of Alabama. His was a most significant address which I wish to insert into the RECORD at this point, as I consider it a statesmanlike expression of the views on this subject held by a vast majority of Americans:

#### CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

(By William L. Dickinson)

President Yen (Chia-Kan), Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, Ladies and Gentlemen: It is indeed a privilege for me to be here today representing the great majority of the American people who stand as firm friends of the free peoples and nations represented in the membership of the World Anti-Communist League. Yours is an organization of which true democratic peoples have great admiration. You are now in your tenth annual convention and the free world owes you for the valiant battle you have been waging on behalf of freedom during these past ten years and to the organization which preceded you, The Asian Peoples Anti-Communist League, which was founded in 1954.

This week marks the 18th anniversary of Captive Nations Week. In 1959, the U.S. Congress passed the Captive Nations' Week resolution which President Dwight D. Eisenhower signed into U.S. law. The historic resolution continues to focus American moral and political attention and concern on the world's captive nations and peoples who are under communist domination. We continue in our determination to assist in every peaceful way their eventual freedom and independence. This resolution is still in force. Its strength lies in the fact that despite the so-called era of détente, the majority of the free peoples of the world continue to maintain their concern about captive peoples. Today as we meet here well over a billion human beings live under these dreadful conditions.

Many in my country urge that we "coexist" and cooperate with tyranny, but I am not one of them. That great American, Abraham Lincoln, once observed that no nation can endure half-slave and half-free, that liberty and tyranny are incompatible. The same axiom can be applied to the world at large. Freedom and slavery are in perpetual conflict and, in the end, one or the other must triumph. The leaders of the Free World must recognize that there can be no peace with oppression. The only real choices are victory or surrender. For this reason, I am not interested in "détente" or "coexistence" with Communism. I am interested in victory over communism. Only through victory can genuine peace ever be achieved.

Your theme this year is: Anti-Communism for Freedom and Human Rights! Today we hear a lot being said about human rights in certain quarters. However, I don't believe enough is being said about the human rights of those peoples living under communist domination. Indeed, persecution and the denial of fundamental human rights continues unabated behind the iron and bamboo curtains. We see an intensified clampdown on dissenters in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

Word continues to leak out about inhumane treatment and imprisonment of human beings who simply desire to do personal things like worship God—having nothing to do with politics. It is clear to me, in spite of pledges to the contrary made by the Soviet and Eastern European Communists, two years ago during the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, no actual human rights improvements have been realized in that area of the world. All we have seen this year, as the same 35 nations convened again, are public-relations-type demonstrations and statements from behind the iron curtain about improved human rights, new constitutions and the like—but nothing of substance has been accomplished for real human rights.

Because we are honored this week to be the guest of the Chinese people, in the Republic of China, Free China, I would simply like to close my brief remarks by paying what I believe to be just tribute to the brave and tenacious people of the Republic. You are a bright, happy, creative people—ever improving the quality of life. You have been on the firing line for Freedom in Asia for over 50 years. While you grieve about your brothers and sisters on the mainland who exist without freedom, you have continued to shine brightly as a beacon of liberty—to provide them with hope that some day the entire great Chinese peoples will again live together in freedom.

I contrast what I see here with what I saw when I was in Communist China in April of last year. I was saddened by what I saw. They are a colorless, drab society, mirthless—without joy—regimented from birth. I was saddened when I heard a propagandized child say, "I was happy when I woke up this morning because last night I dreamed of Chairman Mao." An example of the yearning for Liberty by people on the mainland, was the occasion just two weeks ago of a pilot of the Chinese Communist Air Force miraculously escaping that Communist dictatorship. Why did he say he escaped? Because he could no longer live without freedom.

What did he escape to? What did he escape from? Although starting at a point of equal devastation with the Communists in 1949 the democratic Republic of China (ROC) has far outdistanced Communist China in every measurable field of comparable endeavor. We all know the Republic of China has enjoyed substantial growth and now has one of the highest standards of living in Asia. The per capita income in the Republic is approximately three times that of Communist China. This progress is a characteristic of freedom. You have a wonderful, thriving, progressive society.

Two hundred and one years ago the founders of my country declared that "All men are created equal." By this they meant that all men everywhere are equal in their natural yearning for liberty. It is in the very nature of man to be free. They believed, as I do, that some day every man on this planet will be free. Yet believing in this alone will not bring it about. Freedom is not free. Mankind must fight to win it and must always be prepared to fight to defend it. The founders of my country were tired of the yoke of tyranny and took it upon themselves to throw it off. These were men who were determined to change the course of their destinies and, against tremendous odds, would



settle for nothing less than total victory. If it could be done in America, then it can be done anywhere in the world. And I tell you—the majority of the American people stand with you in your hope that one day we will see freedom throughout all China.

In closing, I want to emphasize, that until all captive peoples and nations achieve their objectives of liberty we must not mute our concern, support, and solidarity with their unfulfilled aspirations. As free men and women, we must continue to work for the freedom for others that we have for ourselves. We cannot—indeed no free men or society can—rest until all men possess the same cherished existence. Thank you for allowing me to be a part of this wonderful activity.

## SECOND LOOK AT SACCHARIN URGED BY CANADIAN PAPER

**HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, a controversial public health debate was precipitated in March of this year when Canadian Health Minister Marc Lalonde announced a ban on saccharin, based on animal tests purporting to show a potential risk of cancer. The U.S. Food and Drug Administration, acting upon the findings of the Canadian agency, subsequently announced a proposed ban on the artificial sweetener on March 9, 1977, thereby touching off a dispute within our borders which continues to split the scientific community and which has produced a shocked and angry reaction from many Americans, particularly diabetics and those with weight control problems. They believe that saccharin has been safely used by the public for more than 80 years and that, as the only noncaloric sweetener permitted on the U.S. market, saccharin has positive beneficial effects which outweigh any theoretical potential risk. As a result of this debate, legislation is now pending in the House—of which I am cosponsor—which would delay for 18 months any proposed ban by the FDA and which would permit further scientific review by the National Institutes of Health.

It is, therefore, quite significant that one of the leading newspapers of Canada, the Toronto Star, has recently urged the Canadian Health Minister to bring back saccharin and in an editorial dated September 1, has accused Canadian health officials of failing to "look before you leap" in their attempt to eliminate a "remote and theoretical" risk.

Mr. Speaker, when one of the leading newspapers of Canada calls for reversal of the saccharin decision, I believe that we in the United States have stronger reason to believe that the Canadian precedent is not one which we should blindly emulate. For that reason, together with my colleague, the Honorable DAVID E. SATTERFIELD, III of Virginia, we have scheduled a saccharin briefing for Members and their staffs, from 3 to 5 p.m., September 15, in room 2125, Rayburn House Office Building, at which a number of scientists who have been reviewing the Canadian test data as well

as other studies can assist us in placing in perspective the public consequences of a U.S. saccharin ban. We will hear new scientific evidence on saccharin from Dr. Philip Cole, Harvard School of Public Health, who will review the Howe/Miller Canadian epidemiological study; a paper authored by Sir Richard Doll of Oxford University, England, will be provided; new American epidemiological information will be presented by Dr. Irving Kessler of Johns Hopkins University and R. Ernest Wynder, founder and president of the American Health Foundation, and Dr. Neal S. Bricker, director of Institute of Kidney Diseases of the University of Miami, will present new animal research data. I am sure my colleagues will find this briefing by prominent scientists both up-to-date and information:

### OTTAWA SHOULD BRING BACK SACCHARIN

"Look before you leap" is a proverb which Health Minister Marc Lalonde should take to heart. His ban last March on the artificial sweetener, saccharin, on the ground that it was a possible cancer hazard, now threatens to create a new and much more serious health danger.

The banning of saccharin was not due to any medical evidence that the substance causes cancer in human beings: no human case of cancer has ever been traced to it. The decision was based on a laboratory experiment in which rats were fed enormous doses of saccharin, after which some of them developed bladder cancer.

The ban was sharply criticized at the time. Scientists pointed out that to get as much saccharin as was given the rats, a human being would have to drink 500 cans of diet pop a day. It was also noted that similar experiments conducted on monkeys—which are much closer to human beings in their anatomy and physiology than rats—showed no ill-effects from the use of saccharin.

But the federal health officials were adamant and imposed a staged ban to eliminate saccharin from food and drink by the end of the year.

This decree is having consequences which the Ottawa mandarins apparently did not foresee. Saccharin has been used largely in low-calorie foods and soft drinks for diabetics, weight-watchers and others on special diets with a minimum of sugar.

Now the replacement many manufacturers are looking at, fructose, is apparently similar to ordinary sugar in the way it affects diabetics and others with health problems. The danger is they could end up using low-calorie products without realizing that they are, in fact, getting more than their safe intake of sugar.

Health officials are now scurrying about trying to devise protective measures. It has apparently only just begun to dawn on them that they may have created a real and immediate health hazard in their efforts to eliminate what may be a remote and theoretical one.

Bring back the saccharin.

## TO HONOR BERTHA MODRZYNSKI

**HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the accomplishments of one of my constituents, Mrs. Bertha Modrzynski, who

has been recognized as an outstanding leader in the Polish community in Cleveland. She is being honored by the Polish Falcons of America, Saturday, September 10, for her many accomplishments.

She has received a number of awards from the Polish community and has been active in promoting growth and understanding of the Polish tradition in the Greater Cleveland area.

In addition to her activities in the Polish community, Mrs. Modrzynski has found time to serve as a member of the Cuyahoga County Democratic Central Committee, and as a member of the Federated Democratic Women of Ohio.

I want to congratulate Bertha Modrzynski, wife, mother, grandmother, community leader, political activist. She is living proof that a woman can have a place in the home and in the world, and be a success in both.

## RATIFICATION OF THE PANAMA CANAL TREATY

**HON. BOB STUMP**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, with the signing of the Panama Canal Treaty, it is now the duty of the Senate to ratify it. However, separate questions should be addressed by the House in the treaty's ratification process—that of disposing of the U.S. property and expenditures of public money. For the following reasons, I have cosponsored a House resolution which would allow the House of Representatives to represent the views of our constituents by voting yes or no on the ratification of the treaty. The 1903 Haybunau-Barilla treaty provides:

The Republic of Panama grants to the United States all the rights, power and authority with the zone . . . which the United States would possess and exercise if it were the sovereign of the territory . . . to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power or authority.

In 1906, the U.S. Supreme Court found that as a result of the treaty the Canal Zone was U.S. territory. The U.S. Constitution specifically states that Congress has the power to dispose of all property belonging to the United States.

The Constitution also gives Congress authority over expenditure of public money. Huge amounts of money are involved in this treaty deal, but the administration is also attempting to carry out the financial end through back door loans and grants to Panama without the consent of the House.

One question is whether the \$600 million Panama Canal Operations Fund currently on deposit with the U.S. Treasury goes to Panama as part of the financial package over which Congress is being denied its constitutional voice. This country has an investment of \$6.15 billion in the Panama Canal. Payments to Panama to take the canal are \$1.89 billion. If Panama wants the canal, they should be buying it from the United States and not being paid to take it.

Not all of the questions are financial. Even now, Alaskan oil which is needed desperately all over the country is being transported through the Panama Canal. The security of that oil is vital to the future of this country. The question of oil alone shows the potential effect of the canal on national security.

Before the American people allow the canal to be given away, they want to know that the Government of Panama is stable and responsible enough to run the canal. Without the stability, rights under the proposed treaty would be meaningless.

Those who are trying blackmail to obtain acceptance of this treaty by threats of guerrilla war have chosen the worst possible way to persuade Congress and the American public. If the treaty cannot stand on its own merit, we must stand up for our rights or this country will have no international credibility.

Until these and many other questions are answered I shall oppose the treaty and fight for a vote in the House of Representatives.

#### BOUNDARY WATERS CANOE AREA

### HON. MICHAEL T. BLOUIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. BLOUIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to present my testimony concerning the Boundary Waters Canoe Area proposals given August 4, 1977 before the House Subcommittee on National Parks and Insular Affairs:

Mr. Chairman, and members of the subcommittee—let me say first of all that I appreciate the opportunity to testify before this subcommittee this morning and I am honored to follow in the footsteps of my distinguished colleagues, Mr. Fraser, Mr. Vento and Mr. Oberstar, all of whom have illustrated a concern and an interest in the preservation of natural resources which I think is exceptional and commendable. I, for one, appreciate their concern and their leadership and I want to state that for the record.

Mr. Chairman, I am particularly grateful for the opportunity to discuss briefly with the subcommittee the preservation and conservation of one of the nation's precious natural resources: The Boundary Waters Canoe Area.

Over 60 years ago, President Theodore Roosevelt—writing in an issue of Outlook magazine—drew a parallel which is no less dramatic . . . and certainly no less correct . . . today than it was then, in 1913. "The civilized people of today," he wrote, "look back with horror at their medieval ancestors who wantonly destroyed great works of art . . . or sat slothfully by, while they were destroyed. We regard attic temples and roman triumphal arches and gothic cathedrals as of priceless value . . . but we are, as a whole, still in that low state of civilization where we do not understand that it is also vandalism to wantonly destroy or to permit the destruction of what is beautiful in nature—"

Whether it be a cliff, a forest or a species of mammal or bird."

Today, some 63 years later . . . and thanks in no small measure to people like Teddy Roosevelt and those who followed in his footsteps . . . we have made some obvious

progress in terms of environmental programs—and in terms, too, of the public awareness of the value and the necessity for such programs.

President Carter, in his environmental message to Congress last May, recognized the overwhelming importance of a meaningful environmental protection and conservation program. "Americans long thought that nature could take care of itself," the President said, "or that, if it did not, the consequences were someone else's problem. As we know now, that assumption was wrong."

In a section on wilderness areas and wildlife, the President wrote: "In its land and its history, a nation finds the things which give it continuity. By preserving places that have special natural value, we can ensure that our children and grandchildren have a chance to know something of the America that we and our ancestors simply took for granted."

I know the subcommittee is familiar with the boundary waters issue. It represents perhaps a classic confrontation between conservationists and commercial interests, it poses questions which reach far beyond the immediate issue—

Questions which speak to some very basic decisions about this nation's commitment to wildlife and wilderness preservation.

We're talking about over one million acres—some of it marred by man-made scars, but much of it as pristine and virgin as it was a thousand years ago . . . a place of incredible beauty, natural variety and ecological stability . . . wilderness one-third larger than the combined total of wilderness areas this side of the Rockies.

We're talking about an area where the pine trees are over three centuries old . . . where the rugged terrain and jutting cliffs have been left virtually unchanged since the glaciers melted some 14,000 years ago . . . an area dotted by some 1,000 lakes and 1,200 miles of canoe routes . . . the nation's largest and relatively complete example of a northern conifer forest—a place which has been called, and accurately, a living biological laboratory.

I think those of us who have had the experience of being out alone on a river early in the morning, when the sun is just starting to peek over the tree tops . . . or have been camping with just a few other people in a secluded woods or on a quiet river island appreciate what we're talking about . . . that kind of indescribable communion with nature which man feels when he's left alone in the wilderness. It's that kind of experience . . . that kind of opportunity . . . that we want to preserve . . . that we should be anxious to protect.

As you are well aware, the legislation introduced by Congressman Fraser in 1976 and again this year would preserve the entire boundary waters area. It totally outlaws lodging, motorized carriers or mining within the area.

I want you to know that I strongly endorse Mr. Fraser's approach and I urge the subcommittee to approve the Fraser bill. I think it represents nothing less than the least we can do to insure the preservation and survival of a unique natural resource—one which belongs not so much to the commercial interests which border the area, but to the American people. It is truly a national asset as well as a natural resource.

The subcommittee has on file petitions signed by over 10,000 Iowans urging its support for the Fraser bill. That, I think, dramatizes how strongly my fellow Iowans feel about preserving the boundary waters area.

Naturally, we have something of a vested interest in the area . . . Last year, over 6,500 Iowans registered as visitors to the boundary waters wilderness, a number second only

to visitors from Wisconsin and Illinois among the estimated 83,000 out-of-State residents who visited the boundary waters area in 1976. That figure is hardly surprising when you realize that the closest wilderness area for most Iowans, besides the boundary waters, lies as far east as the Appalachians and as far west as the Rockies—and none can match the size, variety or sheer beauty of the boundary waters area.

But at the same time I am constantly impressed with the number of people who are absolutely committed to the preservation of the boundary waters area, even though there is very little likelihood that they will ever have an opportunity to visit the area in person. They recognize it for the natural resource it really is. They are people who believe that we simply cannot compromise on preserving the nation's largest eastern wilderness area and our only lake-land wilderness.

I am reminded of something I read recently in a booklet published by an organization called friends of the boundary waters wilderness. The very closing paragraph, I think, summarized the issue well when it said: "There will always be those who would turn the last stands of virgin timber in the boundary waters into magazines and waste paper . . . who would trade its cold, clear waters for cold, clean cash. There will never be a law so perfect and immutable that the boundary waters can be considered 'saved' forever. But good protective laws and informed citizens can do the job."

The Fraser bill is that kind of law. We need that kind of law, and I am hopeful that this subcommittee in its wisdom will see fit to pass favorably on legislation that includes the major provisions of Mr. Fraser's bill.

#### NO BONDED DEBT FOR YOLO— THANKS ERV MEIER

### HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, one of the lessons we all learned early in our careers in Congress is that no Federal program, however well designed and funded, will be effective unless a talented and committed administrator makes the program work on a daily basis. The same is true for our local units of government.

For the past 16 years, the citizens of Yolo County have benefited from competent administration of their county government under the leadership of county executive Ervin Meier. Erv was selected in 1961 as Yolo County's first county executive and has served admirably in that post ever since. He will retire on September 15 and it is appropriate that we pause for a few moments to salute Erv Meier's long record of outstanding public service.

Erv Meier is a man with an extensive record of accomplishments dating back to service with the War Labor Board. Later, as a private consultant, Erv helped reorganize government programs in the city of Los Angeles, the State of Washington, and the Republic of El Salvador, among others. He made a number of significant contributions in the State of California as the administrator of the Weimar Medical Center, and as executive secretary of the Joint Transportation



Committee of the California State Legislature. In each of these positions he demonstrated a tenacity and understanding of the subject matter that impressed his professional colleagues.

Erv's tenure as county executive in Yolo County has been equally productive. A new jail was constructed. The county courthouse was remodeled and facilities for the Public Works Department and almost all other government agencies were expanded, and in a reasonable and orderly fashion. Erv is particularly proud of the expansion of the county library system so that the several small towns in Yolo County now enjoy modern library programs.

During Erv Meier's administration, he has seen the county of Yolo grow from a population of 60,000 to 110,000. The staff of the county government has grown from 600 to 1,300 and again in a reasonable and orderly manner.

During Erv's tenure, Yolo County made the transition from a rural county to a county with many suburban communities. The expansion and improvement of government services to keep pace with this growth made many demands on Erv's imagination and administrative talents. With typical attention to detail, Erv and the board of supervisors accomplished this expansion on a pay-as-you-go basis and as Erv leaves his post, the county has no bonded indebtedness whatsoever. Additionally, the county has a healthy contingency fund. Erv's successor is in an enviable position inheriting such a program. In light of the well publicized difficulties faced by many local governments, Erv Meier's fiscal achievements are particularly noteworthy.

Erv always made it a point to do his job and stay out of the politics that often engulf administrators in our local governments. Maybe this is one of the secrets of his success. He left the politics to the politicians and quietly and competently went about the business of administering the county government.

Erv Meier has achieved these accomplishments by hard work and long hours. Indeed, the members of the board of supervisors have often complained that he did not take enough vacation time. I might say, this was the only major complaint lodged by the supervisors during Erv's many years as county executive. Some complaint.

Erv is still a young man in his early sixties and has much more to contribute. He has indicated that he will continue as executive secretary of the 14 county Sacramento-Mother Lode Regional Association of County Supervisors and will do consultant work once again. He and his wife, Carol, are planning to take a trip to Europe. It is high time, in my opinion, that Erv finally takes a well-deserved vacation.

It has been a personal pleasure to work with Erv. I and the many friends he has made over the years wish him well in the years ahead and thank him for his outstanding contributions to county government in California.

## "GIVEAWAY" OF THE PANAMA CANAL

### HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, during the August recess, I had county meetings throughout my district in Kentucky. I listened to hundreds of my constituents voice their viewpoints and concerns. One frequently mentioned concern was the proposed "giveaway" of the Panama Canal. And let me say that a "giveaway" is exactly how the fine people I represent describe the proposed treaty. The people with whom I met rightly believe that the Panama Canal belongs to the United States in perpetuity, every lock, stock, and barrel of it.

Do the people want to give the canal away? Let me just say that the following letter to the editor of the Richmond Daily Register by Mr. Robert E. Lanter of Richmond, Ky., exemplifies what many people in the United States and in my congressional district are saying about the canal treaty. It is a shame that this administration has not been listening to the people or else we might not now have the treaty.

The letter follows:

RICHMOND, KY.,  
August 16, 1977.

The Editor,  
Richmond Daily Register,  
Richmond, Ky.

DEAR SIR: We Americans are being taken for a bunch of fools. O.K., so you've heard that old song before, but does it ever shock or alarm you? It should. Sad to say, most people couldn't care less. But let me explain.

As we all know, it is against the law of the land to give or sell secrets or anything which is vital to the security of America, especially to those who are openly hostile to our way of life and way of government. And don't ever let yourself be led to believe for a moment that there are not those in the great scheme of world politics who are not working night and day to bury U.S. As a matter of fact, they are right on schedule in their program.

But back to the subject at hand. It concerns the pack of lies the American people are being fed concerning our ownership of the Panama Canal. The treaty drawn up between Panama and the United States in 1904 is as clear as any document can be. The treaty plainly states the ten-mile wide canal zone and the canal itself are to be United States property "in perpetuity" or as the dictionary defines it, "lasting for eternity." Any fool knows that doesn't mean the year 2000.

Now there was no great clamor for us to give up the Canal until the present, unelected, viciously criminal, Communist dictator, Omar Torrijos, overthrew the former government in a military coup about ten years ago. Torrijos is not only a Communist, he has time and time again shown his utter contempt for the United States in his remarks about us. We owe him less than nothing. There is no reason we should even deal with him. For the most part, the people of Panama realize the great advantage of the United States presence in the "Zone" and they let that fact be known.

I mentioned the Communist program earlier. Latin America is very much a part of

that program. This program as set forth well over fifty years ago was summarized and paraphrased into the following famous outline: "First, we will take Eastern Europe. Next, the masses of Asia. Then we shall encircle the last bastion of capitalism, the United States of America. We shall not have to attack; it will fall like overripe fruit into our hands." Who said this? That's right. Lenin wrote it over fifty years ago.

Now our man in the White House is making it come true.

As I said earlier, giving or selling things which are vital to our security is against the law. They call it treason.

Are we really stupid enough to fall into such a trap? I would hope not.

ROBERT E. LANTER.

## THE CLINCH RIVER BREEDER REACTOR: A POOR INVESTMENT FOR JOBS

### HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 8, 1977

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Speaker, opponents of President Carter's decision to forgo construction of the Clinch River breeder reactor demonstration facility—CRBR—have argued that President Carter's decision is antiemployment. This memorandum answers this argument.

The proponents of the Clinch River breeder reactor state that the CRBR is a jobs issue in two senses. First, it is contended that the CRBR is necessary to meet our energy needs. If there is not enough energy there will be unemployment because energy is necessary to run an industrial economy. Second, it is contended that the construction of the breeder and its support facilities will, itself, create jobs.

THE CLINCH RIVER BREEDER REACTOR IS NOT NEEDED

On numerous occasions, the Secretary of Energy and the Council of Economic Advisors have stated that the Clinch River breeder facility simply will not be needed. They have shown that the fuel needs of nuclear reactors can be supplied with domestic uranium. This position is supported by data collected by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, as well as the uranium experts of the Energy Research and Development Administration. Independent assessments by such organizations as the Ford Foundation and by a study sponsored by the conservative American Enterprise Institute also support this conclusion. In sum, without building the Clinch River breeder reactor, the United States will be able to fuel its nuclear reactors. To the extent to which atomic reactors are necessary for a functioning economy, they will be supplied with fuel.

MILLIONS OF OTHER NUCLEAR RELATED JOBS WILL BE CREATED

Second, it is argued that the Clinch River breeder reactor should be built because the project itself creates jobs. Just about any Federal expenditure creates employment directly or indirectly. How-

ever, the charge that the Carter administration is antijobs because it is canceling the construction of the Clinch River breeder reactor must be placed in perspective. The Carter administration supports the construction of about 300 more nuclear powerplants in this country between now and the end of this century. In contrast to the approximately 4,000 man years of employment produced this last year by the Clinch River breeder reactor project, the construction and operation of these 300 powerplants and their fuel cycle facilities for the plants' lifetimes will create over 6,500,000 man years of employment in nuclear-related job categories.

Overall manpower requirements for 300 powerplants' man years	
Activity:	Nuclear
Construction of 300 nuclear powerplants	1,588,500
Construction of fuel cycle support facilities	81,000
Annual operation and maintenance	30,000
Annual operation of fuel cycle	124,200
Total annual requirements	163,200

Total operation and maintenance requirement for 20 years for 300 nuclear powerplants..... 4,896,000  
Total manpower for construction and 30-year operation (typical, assumed plant lifetime)..... 6,565,500

(The information on labor requirements has been collected from reports of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Project Independence Reports and trade association sources.)

#### CLINCH RIVER BREEDER REACTOR: A POOR INVESTMENT FOR JOBS

Not only are the number of jobs in the CRBR project relatively few in comparison to the much larger scale of employment in nuclear-related industries contemplated by the administration's nuclear policies, but building the Clinch River breeder reactor itself is an economically wasteful method of creating jobs.

If the Clinch River breeder reactor is not built, the funds will either be spent as normal Federal expenditures or will be spent in the private sector. In either case, about twice as much employment will be

created by either of these alternative expenditures.

For instance, ERDA has estimated that the \$196 million fiscal year 1977 budget would have produced 4,367 direct jobs. Normally, such an expenditure of Federal funds produces 50 percent additional indirect employment. Thus, the CRBR expenditures for 1977 have produced approximately 6,500 jobs. Each of these jobs, then, would cost about \$29,923 to create, by building the Clinch River breeder reactor. In contrast, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, \$11,104 in average Federal expenditures creates a job. In sum, spending the money on the Clinch River breeder reactor will actually cause unemployment. Spending the money through the Federal Treasury or returning it to the private economy will create more employment.

For more information, contact James M. Cubie, legislative representative, New Directions, 2021 L Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036, phone No. (202) 452-1050.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, September 9, 1977

The House met at 10 o'clock a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*Be of good courage and He shall strengthen your heart, all you that trust in the Lord.—Psalms 31: 24.*

O God of life and love, breathe Thy Spirit upon us as we pray, and help us to realize anew our constant need of Thy strength, Thy wisdom, and Thy peace. Give us to know that Thou art with us and that with Thee we are made equal to every experience and ready for every responsibility.

We pray for peace in our world, for good will among our people, for justice in our land, and for a faith which makes us strong, gives us courage, and spurs us on the upward way to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for all.

Into this day may we go strong in Thee and in the power of Thy might. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1307. An act to require case-by-case review under uniform, historically consistent, generally applicable standards and procedures prior to the award of veterans' benefits to persons administratively discharged under other than honorable conditions from

active military, naval, or air service, and for other purposes; and

S. 1560. An act to restore the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians of Oregon as a federally recognized sovereign Indian tribe, to restore to the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians of Oregon and its members those Federal services and benefits furnished to federally recognized American Indian tribes and their members, and for other purposes.

### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 7555, LABOR, HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATION ACT, 1978

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 7555) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1978, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment remaining in disagreement, insist on the House amendment to the Senate amendment numbered 82, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do so only to receive once again the assurance, which I am sure the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Flood) can render to us, that if, in fact, we do now go back to conference without a motion to instruct being offered to the House conferees, that the House conferees will continue to insist upon the language of the so-called Hyde-Conte amendment dealing with abortion funding?

Mr. FLOOD. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Speaker, as usual the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN) has stated the case and the answer is yes.

Mr. BAUMAN. The gentleman, of

course, knows full well that the House has voted twice on this issue by substantial margins and therefore I do not think it would be necessary at this point to reaffirm that stand by a motion to instruct the conferees.

Mr. FLOOD. That is correct.

I might add that it so happens that what was the Hyde-Conte amendment, because of a procedural matter, had to be reintroduced through my amendment, but it is the same.

Mr. BAUMAN. Forgive me, I should have said the Flood amendment, in honor of my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania.

I thank the gentleman for his assurances.

Mr. FLOOD. I did so just out of an abundance of caution.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. FLOOD, NATCHER, SMITH of Iowa, PATTEN, OBEY, ROYBAL, STOKES, EARLY, MAHON, MICHEL, CONTE, O'BRIEN, and CEDERBERG.

### THE SALE OF F-15 SUPERSONIC FIGHTERS

(Mr. DODD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I was disturbed to learn last week that the Defense Department has recommended the sale of 60 F-15 supersonic fighters to Saudi Arabia. This proposed sale is objectionable in so many respects that I am hard put to understand why it is receiving serious consideration.

Sale of our most advanced attack fighter to Saudi Arabia would drastically alter the regional military balance in